

Towards a Text-Analytical Commentary of Daniel 9:24

Koot van Wyk¹

Abstract

This paper investigates Daniel 9:24 in various ancient versions. The methodology that is used is not the conventional Eclectic Text Method but a reversal back to the Standard-Text Method due to the strong link that 4QDan^a provides with the modern Hebrew textual form with an error margin of less than 1%. It was found that the Ancient Versions, such as Old Latin, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Origen, Jerome in the Vulgate, Coptic, Syriac all tried to discover the Standard-Text that we are privileged to hold in our hands today, but that Library robberies, cultural antagonism, persecutions, book-burning practices, made it difficult to get access to good originals and seemingly the degenerative copies at Qumran provided the only avenue for the versions. Many of the variants originated due to slips of the hands, eye, ear, tongue and memory. It was not their intention to create a new text or to deviate from the text freely. They simply had no choice. The Standard-Text Textual Analysis Method brings these processes in the degenerative character of the versions, which they share with the degenerative character of the scribal practices of Qumran, to the front. Whereas the Eclectic Text Method leads to nihilism since it makes the reader the creator of his/her own text by self-reconstruction, the Standard-Text Textual Analysis Method places the text to be analyzed next to an objective ruler (the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition) and forces the reader to compare differences but also encourages the researcher to discover and see how the variant originated. This was done with various Versions including Latin, Greek, Coptic for Daniel 9:24. One cannot miss the clarity of understanding the origin of the variants. As compared to the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition, they stand in a degenerative position as far as form is concerned. As far as interpretation is concerned it was found that scholars understood Daniel's prophetic times in the correct way using the year-day principle but that the heathen interpreter Porphyry wanted to read events and times back to Antiochus Epiphanes much to the frustration of Jerome. It was found that the Arabic Jewish commentator in the 10th century also suggested the year-day principle for Daniel 9:24 or 490 years for the days. Keeping these rules in mind opens up startling discoveries for the modern interpreter of Daniel who only up to this time has read Daniel through the glasses of the heathen interpreter Porphyry.

1. Introduction

An Analytical Commentary has still to be produced. Many Scholars of fame have worked on the book of Daniel²

¹Koot van Wyk is a Visiting Professor in the Department of Liberal Education at Kyungpook National University Sangju Campus, South Korea and a Conjoint lecturer for Avondale College, Australia. He has a DLitt et Phil in Comparative Semitic Linguistics from the University of South Africa (2004) and a ThD from Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan (2008). He is married to Sook-Young Kim (Phd in New Testament, Andrews University, Michigan USA 2008). She has worked on the "Warrior Messiah" and her dissertation was published by *Cambridge Scholars Publishing*. Acknowledgements should be made here: a special word of thanks to Eugene Ulrich from the Department of Theology, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, who has provided me with the whole corpus of Qumran Daniel arriving 27th of March 2004 in Tochigi, Japan. Appreciation to the State Library in Berlin providing me with Ms. or. Fol. 1203 nr. 34/98 complete of a manuscript written in 1598 and sold to the library by Shapira which is the Hebrew Masoretic Text plus Arabic translation of Saadya Gaon in Hebrew script. The Manuscript of M. W. Shapira of 24th November 1877 was obtained from the British Museum OR 1476 with Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah. The online biblical Coptic text of Daniel is available at <http://www.coptic.org/language/bible/05daniel.html>.

Special thanks to Hana Takla for the Coptic texts. Also to the British Library for providing me with Or. 1314 which is a Coptic and Arabic translation of Daniel. The Arabic of Daniel used for comparison is coming from Walton's Polyglot available from the University of South Africa Library in Pretoria, South Africa. Appreciation also to A. Gelston concerning the Peshitta of Daniel. Gratitude to the University Library of Würzburg for providing the Vetus Latina text of Sabbathier on Daniel arriving 2nd of April 2003. For Greek Papyrus 967 on Daniel 9:24 the following link online is available: http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PTheol/PT29_03v.jpg especially selected, Papyrus Köln Theol. 29,3 verso Daniel 9, 23-27 1-42 172. Very helpful is the British Library for the text of Herman Spiegel, *Saadia al-Fajjumi's Arabische Danielversion* (Dissertation at the University of Bern, published Bern: H. Itzkowski, 1906). Thanks goes to the State Library of Berlin for Eva Rothkirch to send a copy of D. S. Margoliouth, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel by Japhet ibn Ali the Karaite* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889). Margoliouth supplied the Arabic text. A word of thanks is also expressed to the Hebrew University Library in Jerusalem for a copy of Shelomo Morag, *The Book of Daniel: A Babylonian-Yemenite Manuscript* (Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sepher Publishing House LTD., 1973).

²Oscar Löffgren from the University of Upsala worked extensively on the text of Daniel predating 1927. I am honored to have the copy of Löffgren's *Die Äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927) which belonged to Anton Schall of Heidelberg, who was the colleague of Nöldeke at Heidelberg. Nöldeke with J. Wellhausen was taught by the Victorian scholar G. H. Ewald. Löffgren is praised by many scholars for his approach since he also looked sideways to other versions in the

but their purpose was either to just list the variants in the Ancient sources or otherwise they operated with text-critical biases that led to emendations of the Word of God³ and it is the purpose of this commentary to operate with the *hermeneutics of affirmation* rather than *suspicion*,⁴ thus removing the term text-critical and replace it with text-analytical. A further difference in this approach is to decide to use the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition as the very Word of God (without the vowels)⁵ and to operate with the view that any deviation from it by other versions are secondary,⁶ later reworkings,⁷ miscopying,⁸ misreadings,⁹ mishearing,¹⁰ mispronunciations,¹¹ of a serious kind.

variants. He did not live under the illusion that he had created the original Ethiopic text (bookreview of M. Chaîne in *ROC* 26 [1927-1928], pages 4-5). Despite advanced text-critical editions of the so-called Septuagint, Syriac Peshitta and Latin Vulgate and the publications of the Qumran Daniel corpus, we still face the problem that scholars had a tendency to just list the variants instead of discussing them. Enumerating the variants or stringing the connections in some form of weighing method hoping that the voice of majority may give consensus in the reconstruction, is not the only method. How these variant readings originated, is a more tedious work and calls for further research in future with fresh *modus operandi*.

³It is easy to see the *emendation scholars* at work. In the lower register of both the BHK and BHS editions of the consonantal text of the Masoretic Text, are listings of variants from the versions and Qumran and then follow the suggestions for emendations. These suggestions are not the Word of God and neither are they bringing us closer to the Word of God. It is modern attempts to adjust the Word of God according to Grammatical Puritanism or other purely humanistic considerations. The source of the problem of emendation is the principle *lectio facilius potior est* which was applied by Otto Thenius (Walters 1988: 385) and L. Cappellus (see Van der Kooij 1982: 178). Julius Wellhausen used this principle to make eclectic decisions between the Hebrew on one side and the Greek on the other in order to render a more consistent grammar in the syntax or form of the text. The problem with this method is that the driving force for the reconstruction is not extrapolated from the data but is superimposed from the outside onto the data. Wellhausen accepted the Septuagint for the original, a fallacy to start with. He did not take into consideration the different possible methods of copying in order to explain variants in the doublets. He did not know of the degeneration of texts in the Hellenistic period. He worked with a *textus perceptus* and not a *textus receptus*. Wellhausen used the texts only to provide color to his own construct. In his emendations he was not an exegete but an artist or reconstructionist. H. S. Nyberg resisted those who wanted to emend the Masoretic Text too easily and who claim that it is a corrupt "verderbt" text (Nyberg 1934: 242).

⁴Ludwig Feuerbach is the father of the "Hermeneutics of Suspicion" and it is a term that takes on many disguises and Wolfardt Pannenberg in *Basic Questions in Theology* vol. 1 (1970), page 39 states that they have one thing in common: anthropocentrism. Rationalists like Voltaire, Bardt, and Enlightenment scholars like De Wette, Wellhausen and Modernists like Rudolph Bultmann, Martin Hegel can be listed. This article will operate with the *hermeneutics of affirmation*. Pannenberg rejected anthropocentrism, Higher Criticism as a method and upheld the Transcendental in analysis. He is not the ideal but in the right direction. For Feuerbach classified as an atheist, see J. J. F. Durand, *Die Lebende God: Wegwysers in die Dogmatiek* (Pretoria: N. G. Kerkboekhandel, 1976), pages 102-118. If one compares Baruch Spinoza with his *hermeneutics of suspicion* with Isaac Newton with his *hermeneutics of affirmation*: Spinoza studied the biblical text and could not understand it, Newton studied it since he was 12 until 83 and could not stop studying it. Spinoza found the biblical text antagonizing his own thinking, but Newton found it a source of inspiration for his science and life. Spinoza hunted for irregularities he could find in the biblical text, but Newton harmonized the seemingly inconsistencies in biblical text in remarkable ways. For Spinoza's view see his letter to Blyenbergh at Voorburg 28 January 1665 or Letter (34) 21.

⁵The reasons why scholars attack the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition are listed by J. A. Thompson, S. Talmon and I. Seeligmann in *IDBS* as: incorrect word-division; transposition of letters; transposition of words; confusion of similar letters; confusion of words which sound alike; omission for various reasons (*homoioteleuton*, *homoiarchton* or *haplography*); addition through dittography; assimilation of parallel passages; conflation of readings; combination of readings; substitution; harmonization; removal of objectionable expressions. Scholars who do not think that the original authors of the Bible's works exist can be listed: E. Würthwein (1957); M. Noth (1966); R. W. Klein (1974); D. E. Payne (1974); J. A. Thompson, F. E. Deist (1978); E. Tov (1978). They do not think that the original author's text existed and secondly, they do not think it is possible to reconstruct the original text and thirdly, they do not think the aim of textual criticism should be to arrive at the original text. "Two men sat behind bars - the one saw mud, the other one stars" (Ian Hartley). What these Masoretic Text critics overlooked is that these variants listed are normal human slips: *slips of the tongue, hand, eye, ear, and memory*. These errors are a marginal issue. Most manuscripts, slips aside, have the reading of the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition as strong backdrop. Despite a high percentage of degenerative texts at Qumran, for example, the largest percentage of them represents the consonantal form of the Masoretic Text.

⁶They cannot be considered primary copies in the light of Origen's letter to Africanus in 220 CE in which he said that they must "flatter the Jews to give us copies which shall be pure and free from forgery." *PG* 11: 40-41. In 191 CE the library of the *Bibliotheca Pacis* in Rome burnt down and in 212 CE Emperor Caracalla wanted to burn some authors' books. Book-burning, censorship, library building operations, book thefts and robberies caused good copies of books to be hidden and thus they were not easily available (Forbes 1936: 114-125).

⁷Daniel 11:40 presents two forms of the text for Theodotion's private Greek translation in 190 CE. There is the seventh century CE reading of Codex Ambrosianus which one may term Theodotion 1 and also a second reading from Codices 22 and others as the work of Theodoret of Cyrrhus near Antioch witnessed. It is from his books that the variant in Theodotion or Theodotion 2 for this verse is cited (Field 1875: 932). The commentator is cited by Field to say that these codices and Theodoret's reading is presenting an altered interpretation quae altera videtur interpretatio = in which an altered interpretation is seen. This is not the case of an altered interpretation but a case of a different Hebrew form. The altered Hebrew form is in the same space where there is an omission of the last two words in 230 CE with Origen's form of the Septuagint. In the 400 CE edition of the Greek both words were omitted and this edition is flooded with problems. In both Theodotion forms (1 and 2) the last word is kept unaltered. The word for earth is altered to the singular form. There must have been a difficult reading for Theodotion and this difficulty was continued in the Codex Vaticanus of 400 CE and in Jerome's copy that he used in 396 CE and of course in both forms used for Theodotion 1 and Theodotion 2 of which on is in Codex Ambrosianus of 616 CE and the other in Theodoret's citation of 403 CE. The omission of the last two words as in Origen of 230 CE's Greek, the Codex Vaticanus of 400 CE is also in the Syriac Peshitta from the seventh century CE. The Coptic scribes did not follow the omission. Theodotion 1 follows the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition the closest of the two forms, a text also

They are the slips of the hand,¹² tongue,¹³ ear,¹⁴ eye¹⁵ and memory.¹⁶

followed by Jerome's Vulgate and also by the Coptic. Theodotion 2 finds echoes in Origen, Codex Vaticanus of 400 CE and the Syriac. What could have happened in the past, is that one must understand the process of ancient copying involved in many steps. A person was dictating while another one was copying what he heard on a wax tablet. This wax tablet was then copied to a papyrus and then from the papyrus it was transferred by dictation to a scribe who wrote it on a vellum and finally ladies were asked to copy it for the codices in a beautiful handwriting. Sometimes a notebook of the editor originated in which errors were picked up and corrected in the margin as well as some marginal notes or interpretations that were added representing the understanding of the editor during his lifetime. If later translators get hold of this notebook instead of the final copy of the Hebrew manuscript and if they do not know how to understand the memo points added by the editor they may enter all that is written in one line in order not to leave out anything. The Codex Vaticanus scribe in 400 CE was probably one of those victims. That is why the supralinear interpretation of king of the south now became Egypt. If for example Theodotion supervised the papyrus from wax, the private vellum made (from papyrus to vellum) and the final copy of Theodotion (dictated to ladies from the vellum to be written in codices), one sits with three different text forms for Theodotion. That is why one can have a Theodotion 1 reading form and a Theodotion 2 reading form even under supervision of the same person.

⁸In Daniel 9:27 the Coptic of Or. 1314 and also the edition of Tattam has a double entry of the same verse. The second entry is not exactly the same as the first one. There are two different versions of the same verse. Takla lists (Takla 1996, 5-9) the other Coptic texts available on Daniel: Amundsen, L. "Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection." *Symbolae Osloenses* 24 1945, 121-140; Bardelli, G. *Daniel Copto Memphitice*, Pisa, Pieraccini, 1849 (112 pages); Boud'Hors, P. *Catalogue des Fragments Coptes I. Fragments Biblique Nouvellement Identifies*. Bibliotheque Nationale Paris, 1987; Boud'Hors, P. *Catalogue des Fragments Coptes de la Bibliotheque Nationale et Universitaire de Strassbourg I. Fragments Biblique*. CSCO 577.Subsidia 99. Louvain, 1998; Ciasca, A. *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani Iussu et Sumptibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Editi*. Vol. II. Rome, 1889; Crum, W. E. *Coptic Manuscripts Brought from the Fayyum* by W. M. Flinders Petrie. London, 1893; Cyrille, II. *Liber Paschae Secundum Ordinem Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*. Cairo, 1899; Leipoldt, J. "Sa'idische Texte." *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen Zu Berlin*. Band I. Berlin, 1904; Maspero, G. *Fragments de la Version Thebaine de l'Ancien Testament*. Memoires Publies par les Membres de la Mission Archaeologique Française au Caire VI Fascicule I. Paris, 1892; Münter, F. *Specimen Versionum Danielis Coptiarum Nonum eius Caput Mephitice et Sahidice Exhibens*. Rome, 1786; Pernigotti, S. I. "Papiri Copti dell' Università Cattolica di Milano." *Agyptus* 65 1985, 67-105; Quatremere, E. "Daniel et les douze petit Prophetes Manuscrits Coptes de la Bibliotheque Imperiale no. 2. Saint-Germain no. 21." *Notice et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque Publies par l'Institut de France*. VII. Paris, 1810; Quecke, H. *Untersuchungen zum Koptischen Studengebet*. Louvain, 1970; Tattam, H. *Prophetas Majores in Dailecto Linguae Aegyptiacae Memphitica seu Coptica Editi cum Versione Latina*. T. H. Ezechiel et Daniel. Oxford, 1852; Till, W. C. "Wiener Faijumica." *Le Museon* 49 1936, 180-187; Till, W. C. and P. Sanz, *Eine Griechisch-Koptische Odenhandschrift*. Rome, 1937; Till, W. C. "Coptic Biblical Fragments in the John Rylands Library." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 34 1952, 432-458; Tuki, R. *hapdinhybi nte tmetreqsemsi ntinuctyrion iui nem hapdinhmbi pte pifewout nem hapdinhwc nem pikatameroc pabot*. Khidmat al-Asrar al-Mukaddasah. Rome, 1763; Bohairic codices: JR419 Daniel; JR420 Daniel; P58 Minor Prophets and Daniel; P96 Minor Prophets and Daniel; PL. Bibl. 11 Isaiah, Jeremiah and Daniel; PL. Bibl. 13 Daniel and Lamentations; SA. Bibl. 72 Minor Prophets, Daniel, Revelation; SA Bibl. 73 Minor Prophets and Daniel; SA Bibl. 93 Daniel, Minor Prophets; VB123 Daniel and Minor Prophets. Anyone interested in biblical texts in Coptic should have access to *Coptic Bibliography* 4 Supplement 2 September 1989 - February 1990 and biblical Coptic texts are listed in Group 30 until Group 35 page 1 (21 pages). One further example was listed: Gehman, H. S. "The Sahidic and Bohairic Versions of the Book of Daniel." *JBL* 46 (1927), 279-330.

⁹In Daniel 11:40 Church Father Jerome in 396 CE was either tired or could not read clearly or was too old to read the letters properly and he left out in his reading the *resh* that is at the end of the verb and mistranslated it for the Hebrew and Aramaic word for come = רש . That is why one reads the word *venit* in the Latin Vulgate that is not in the Hebrew.

¹⁰Papyrus 967 scribe of Daniel 7:20 in 200 misheard the word $\lambda\alpha\lambda\omega\nu$ and an acoustic misperception resulted in the form $\lambda\alpha\lambda\omega\nu$. See also the earlier example in the verse where $\tau\omega\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\tau\omega\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ of Origen's Greek form in 240 CE was read as $\tau\omega\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\tau\omega\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ by the scribe of Papyrus 967. The definite article *the* $\tau\omega\upsilon$ preceding the word *prophet* disappeared completely and was swallowed up in one word in this Papyrus copy.

¹¹Daniel 7:13 provides the *acoustic misperception* or problems in pronunciation by the reader for in the Coptic of the verse Or. 1314 the word was read as $\text{a}^{\text{m}}\ \text{e}\ \text{f}\ \text{m}$; instead of $\text{a}\ \text{m}\ \text{e}\ \text{f}\ \text{m}$; as it is in Tattam's edition of 1836.

¹²For a case of a slip of the hand one may turn to Daniel 11:45 in which the Hebrew manuscript of Aquila had letter very illegible due to a slip of the hand. Aquila read in 130 CE $\text{הר זבי} = \text{הר זבי}$ the mountain *Sabi*. It is possible that a reader of the same manuscript of Aquila (which letters were illegible and causing a mixture of two words in one. The *tsade* /צ/ was probably heard as a *zayin* /ז/ and the *beth* /ב/ was misheard by the scribe listening to a dictation of the Semitic text, as a *qoph* /ק/. Plosives like /b/ and /q/ can easily be confused in slips of the ear. Compare the modern example *one cup of weak coffee* acoustically misperceived as *one Cocoa Wheat Puff* (Bond 1999: 56). In essence the rhythm of the syllables is the same as the source word and its misperceived target word.

$\text{ב} \quad \text{ז} \quad \text{ק} \quad \text{ב}$

$\text{ל} \quad \text{ה} \quad \text{ר} \quad \text{ז} \quad \text{ב}$

Word resulted in a slip of the ear and was acoustically misperceived with an extra consonant infixed between the rolled dental /r/ and the dental fricatives /s/ and /z/. See the case in modern linguistics of *your nation* that became *urination* (Bond 1999: 76). In this case an extra syllable is added with the addition of the /i/ and the word boundary is lost. See also *herobituary* acoustically misperceived as *her habituary* (Bond 1999: 86 at 5.2.2.). In this case after the /r/ there is an addition of /h/. Word boundary played a role in the articulation here since the fast articulation of the rolled dental and the lengthening of it opened the situation for the origin of an extra syllable of a laryngeal to be perceived.

¹³A case of the slip of the tongue can be seen in Daniel 11:41 where the Syriac misread the second word as *Israel* because of the similarity of letters. One can understand the origin of the variant better by looking at Field 1875: 932. It is possible that the Syriac Copy of the Peshitta read first: ܐܝܪܐܝܠ but it was then corrected supralinearly as ܐܝܪܐܝܠ . Possibly in successive copies the

supralinear word was added into the text and became confused with the next word אֶרֶץ resulting in a form of *Israel*. If this word shifted later and entered after אֶרֶץ then we have the same form as we have in the Syro-hexapla of Codex Ambrosianus for Origen, namely, $\text{καὶ πολλὰ ἐν ταῖς γαῖαις}$. There is nothing in the Greek or Syriac that gives us a hint as to why the word *many* would have been confused for *earth*. However in the Hebrew text that was the basis for translation there was probably a misreading so that *to the land* was read instead of *in the land*. In the notebook of the editor to this Hebrew he may have put the correct reading supralinearly. In successive copies the supralinear correction shifted by someone who did not realize it was a correction and that it is not the final copy but only an intermediate manual to the editor. Due to bad handwriting and methods of slip of the tongue, dictation problems and memorization problems in copying, it moved after *many*. Origen had this reading in 240 CE for his edition of the Septuagint. The correction in the Hebrew would have looked like this: אֶרֶץ־אֶרֶץ , but resulted in *land many*. This last example is a correct reading of the word with its error entered in the same line but what was supralinear moved first and what was intent moved second. *Slips of the tongue* are in the area of *articulatory linguistics* and N. Poulisse (1999) listed the kinds of slips that one may find in modern languages: lexical slips; malapropisms (substitution of a word by a phonological related one); phonological slips; morphological slips; syntactical slips; substitution; exchange; shift; blend; deletion; addition; haplogy. Four extra phenomena are mentioned, namely, accommodation; reparation; ambiguous cases and double slips (Poulisse 1999: 103-114).

¹⁴In the Old Latin of Daniel 9:27 rendering of Church Father Tertullian (see Sabbathier 1743: 877) of the text in 189 CE the Old Latin text contained an *acoustic misperception* when the semitic text was copied to the Latin translator and the word *kanaph* כַּנָּף was mistakenly heard as *qadosh* קָדוֹשׁ referring to sacred so the translator of the Vetus Latina translated et execratiō vastationis "and the curse [] of laying waste." The words are not in the original. The root *kanaph* כַּנָּף does not refer to *temple* or *sanctuary* but to *wing*, *shoulder* or *lap*. Aquila interpreted it as *leader* ἀρχὼν in 130 CE and so did Symmachus in 150 CE but the Old Latin translators interpreted it as *sanctuary* in 189 CE and Theodotion interpreted it as *temple* in 190 CE which was also followed by Origen in 240 CE. Jerome 396 and Codex Alexandrinus 410 CE also had *temple*. Wycliff followed the rendering of *temple* in his Middle English translation of 1374 with "and abhominacioun of desolacioun schal be in the temple," thus reading the Vulgate of Jerome but Luther changed it in 1540 to a literal rendering of *wings* in his German translation "und bei den Flugeln werden stehē Greuel der Verwüstung." This was also the case with the 1719 Portuguese of João Ferreira de Almeida, namely that *temple* was not used "e sobre a asa das abominações virá o assolador." Someone in the Middle Ages, before Luther wrote in the margin of a Greek manuscript καὶ εὐσπτερνυγιστοσφραντισμοῦ *and until a wing from destruction* (see Field 1875: 927 at note 38). Calvin kept closer to the Hebrew rendering here with his et super extensionem abominationem obstupescet and thus extensionem is the accusative singular and thus means it was the word *kanaph* כַּנָּף. Both the Vetus Latina and Theodotion were using a defective Semitic original Vorlage. The text was written continuously and the reader or the one dictating divided the letters wrongly. The reader read the shin שׁ of the next word שׁקִי connected to the pe פֿ of *kanaph* כַּנָּף thus כַּנָּשׁ and he misread the letter nun נֿ of *kanaph* כַּנָּשׁ as a daletth דֿ thus כַּנָּשׁ דֿ and the letter pe פֿ as a waw וֿ. In this way the scribe writing misheard the word as כַּנָּשׁ דֿ and he ended with the reading of *qadosh* קָדוֹשׁ leading to the *acoustic misperception* of the word as meaning *holy*, *sacred*, *temple* or *sanctuary*. A corrector wrote in supralinear position a *kaph* above the *qoph* thus כַּנָּשׁ דֿ קַפַּי to signal to future readers that the *qoph* should be a *kaph*. This resulted in the misreading of that *kaph* כַּ as a *beth* בַּ and translated as the preposition *in*. That is why the translator to the Vetus Latina rendered a *beth* and translated *in* from a mistaken כַּנָּשׁ דֿ קַפַּי. What thus happened is that when the text was dictated to the first copyist the *qoph* and *kaph* were interchanged but a corrector placed a *kaph* in supralinear position. It is possible that in the notebook the *al* אֶל was also left out but then added in supralinear position in the notebook to the Vetus Latina scribe thus אֶל קַפַּי that is why the Vetus Latina scribe left out the *al* in his translation of 189 CE. He may have thought that he should only select one of the two prepositions, not both, which were in supralinear position. Jerome may have used the same Vetus Latina notebook but interpreted the two prepositions *beth* and *al* as two legitimate entries and change the first preposition *al* as a verb meaning *shall come* by adding an extra *he* to *al* אֶל־הוּ. The error originated in the time of the Vetus Latina (189) but was carried further by Theodotion (190), Origen (240) and Jerome (389). Papyrus 967 dating to 200 CE has some very interesting errors and *slips* in Daniel 9:27: omission due to homoioteleuton $\text{ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑπτὰ καὶ [] βδομήκοντα}$, omission [], addition καὶ , interchange of word or addition καὶ and the addition καὶ . The Papyrus used the word "end time" $\text{ἐὸς συντέλειας αἰῶνος}$. Z. Bond (1999) listed the cases of *slips of the ear* in modern acoustical linguistics: additions, omissions, substitution, loss of consonants, syllable added, syllable lost, affecting more than one syllable, addition or loss of words (Bond 1999: 39-56). There are word-boundary problems of the shape of words (Bond 1999: 71-79). As far as lexicon is concerned there is the creation of non-words, substitution of words, and contracted forms of words (Bond 1999: 99-115). In syntax there are sometimes radical restructuring, order errors, words-boundary errors and constituent-boundary errors (Bond 1999: 117-124).

¹⁵In Daniel 9:19 in Greek Papyrus 967 dating to 200 CE the word for *Israel* is substituted with *Jerusalem*. The spelling of *Zion* is *S ion* and there is a long elaboration of a midrashic kind to describe the character of the Lord. This variant is not in Theodotion's 190 private Greek translation and also not in the Vetus Latina of 189. Is it possible that an abbreviation was wrongly interpreted? The word for *Jerusalem* in the Coptic Text British Library 1314 at Daniel 9:16 is ⲓⲛⲓⲙ and for the Coptic of Israel in Daniel 9:19 is ⲡⲓⲥⲓⲛ . Does this mean that the Greek abbreviations were IAHM and ISA ? There is no connection in the phonology or orthography for this misunderstanding. As impossible it is to understand the misunderstanding of letters in the Greek, a viable option is found in the Semitic form of the text. There is a similarity between ישראל *israel* and ירושלם *yerusalaim*. In the earliest texts the letters were written continuously so that a misdivision of the mem at the end of the word for *Jerusalem* would result in an even closer resemblance: ישראל *israel* and ירושלם *yerusalaim*. Misunderstanding in the Greek of Codex Alexandrinus and in the Coptic as well as in Papyrus 967 came from a misdivision in the letters and a slip of the eye by interchanging the /s/ letters (*shin* and *sin* which in the original were difficult to distinguish) with the /r/ in position. *Israel* (sr) and *Jerusal* (rs) is an interchange of these letters. The elaboration of the verse with midrashic information may mean that an Aramaic Targum may have been the origin of the Greek in Daniel.

¹⁶The original texts were not available to the translators and they were using copies that were made under most stressing of situations. The Romans were taking the manuscripts and books they could find as booty to their own projects of library building in Rome. Some emperors placed a ban on certain books or genre of books and they burned or destroyed it. This led to the idea that copies were made from acoustic situations. It appears that the readers went into the library in Rome, read the text, memorized it and then walked out and dictated it to scribes who copied it on wax. On all levels there were errors. In the case of the semitic text that served as Vorlage to the translator during the days of Origen in 240 CE, it seems that a number of letters were missing and certain letters misread in Daniel

2. A New Approach Attempted

I have undertaken to not only list the variants but also explain their origin. It is a tedious task that allows me to move from verse to verse after spending a minimum of one hour or more on one verse. This project started in Tochigi Prefecture in Japan and took five years to reach the current stature. It is not completed and editing is seriously called for. The *modus operandi* of modern textual criticism disqualifies anyone to edit this work. The answer is basic and simple: eclecticism is nullified;¹⁷ the books of the Hebrew Bible did not undergo development and growth other than the original author or authors revisions directly under his supervision or directly by the original author's hands.¹⁸ The consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition did not originate only in the exile or post-exilic period.¹⁹

3. Past Approaches

The views of Emmanuel Tov *et alon* textual criticism, represent one option that scholars could have taken and did since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.²⁰

12:11. Instead of וַיִּמְעַת the scribe thought that he heard נָעַ. This led to the misreading in the Greek of ἀφ' ἡ = *from*. Supralinear additions also entered the text later. A *kaph* was read as a *beth* and the correction was made supralinearly but due to *slips of the memory* the supralinear additions floated to a different order in the sentence as one can see in the Vulgate of Jerome in 389 CE between the original words *abomination* and *desolation* for Jerome's attempt as *abomination* *desolation*.

¹⁷I tend to think that major constituent boundary problems, phrases out of order and lexical substitutions should be investigated in the area of *slips of the memory* in cognitive linguistics. It might be that the reader read the manuscript in a library and memorized it, walked out and dictated it to a writer who wrote it on a wax tablet. From the wax tablet it was transferred to a papyrus by someone who could decipher the writing of the one who had written on the wax. These papyrus writings were then properly transferred to the final copy by female scribes who wrote very carefully. That dictation was involved seems to be supported by the spelling of the personal names. Even the women who finally wrote the papyrus did so by dictation letter by letter, syllable by syllable, word by word or phrase by phrase. Names are misspelled sometimes in the same chapter.

¹⁸The doublets in the Bible are not the product of plagiarism by other authors (later) but are products by the author himself, from his notebook, from his memory, recasting the same narration to a different audience, as a sermon or whatever purpose. Isaiah, for example, was a very learned man and a scribe in the royal palaces from his earlier years. He was surrounded by scribes as colleagues and students and his book is evidence of his knowledge of more than one language. He of course, did not write history for history but focused on the religious perspective of history. Doublets are found in Isaiah as well. Scholars who are using a grammatical puritanical approach to textual studies ignore very important aspects of the ancient world: on a linguistic level, bilingualism; multi-lingualism; loanwords; neologisms and on a scribal level, the age of the author of the text and lastly, the mechanics of writing, namely, whether the author himself wrote or he dictated to a scribe. The first compositional action occurred during the lifetime of the author involved to whom the book refers and the second activity (transmission) may occur centuries and millennia later.

¹⁹The impact of Rationalism and Higher Critical axioms in the biblical literature analysis for the past 200 years, makes it difficult to find examples of scholars who hold that the texts of the Bible are in the form as they were written by the original authors. The fact that nothing was added or omitted from 4QDan^a, strengthening an absolute consistency between 1008 CE and 170 BCE, lends support for the postulation that the book of Daniel composed by Daniel between 605-520 BCE looked no different. It further permits one to assume that if the text was stable during this long period until 175 BCE, that other books of the Bible, for example, Genesis, written by Moses, could be the very form Moses had it in more than a millennium earlier. The quality of Daniel at Qumran is a remarkable example for accuracy over such a long period, more than what can be said of any other book at Qumran or about the later versions.

²⁰The observation by Tov that "the desire to transmit the texts with precision increased in the course of the years" (Tov 1992: 27) is unverified and pure speculation. 4QDan^a is contrary to Tov's view. The precision between Qumran Daniel and B19 is sometimes 99%. The idea that there was a plurality of texts existing side by side in the Second Temple Period and that later the differences became less (Tov 1992: 29) is only his *ratio decidendi*. Why was there no decreasing or increasing variation between 4QDan^a and B19 with more than a millennium separating the two? One should not jump to the conclusion that because five different groups of texts are identified at Qumran that Judaism of the Second Temple Period was careless overall about the form of the text or that there was no concept of a single form of the text in those days. The fluidity-of-text-theory is rejected because of 4QDan^a. The Samaritan Pentateuch classification of Tov can be reduced considerably: he lists 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b as texts that reflect the characteristic features of the later Samaritan Pentateuch, with exception of the ideological readings (Tov 1992: 115). In 4QpaleoExod^m only two letters (*he* followed by *ayin*) survived in line one of column XXI of the upper fragment. This is supposedly a link to the book of Exodus. The editor took two letters as the connection to Exodus 20:19a. The remainder of the three fragments is from Deuteronomy 5:24ff. Two letters are not enough to establish a connection beyond any reasonable doubt. The left of the margin of the lower fragment in column XXI is too small when compared to the left margin clearly surviving in Column I. The surviving letter in the first line of the Deuteronomy passage is too far over the edge to qualify as part of Exodus. The editors could not solve all the problems in the lines of the reconstruction, even using the Samaritan Pentateuch of Von Gall's edition. There is too much space between the second relative particle (line 28) and the first relative particle (line 27) at the bottom of the third fragment on Column XXI (compare Plate XVII). It rather appears that it was misreadings of a bad handwriting (*slips of the hand*) in Paleo-Hebrew that simulated the form of the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition. Exodus 7:18b (contrary to Tov 1992: 98) is not so much a harmonizing addition as a recasting of the order of phrases following 7:18. In Exodus 7:29b Tov suggested that there is a harmonizing addition based upon 7:26-29 (Tov 1992: 98) but it appears rather that lines 2-3 are from 7:28 and line 4 ends with 7:29. The beginning of 8:1 is in line 4 and this continues into line 5. There is no expansion visible in the extant fragment. Space does not permit to mention all the problems of the conclusions of the editors at Exodus 8:19b; 9:5b; 9:19b; 10:2b; 11:3b; 20:21b; 27:19b where it rather seems that line 1 (their line 7) is from Exodus 27:18 and line 2 (their line 8) is from Exodus 27:19. Line 3 (their line 9) is from Exodus 27:9; 30:10. The problem is this: what are we to make of a text from Qumran that corresponds (like 4Q158) sometimes to the Greek (Exodus 20:17 fragments 7-8 line 2), sometimes to the Syriac (Genesis 32:30 in fragments 1-2 line 6), and sometimes to the Samaritan Pentateuch and sometimes unique

F. M. Cross has led his students on this course of which Tov and others are the products.²¹ However, as Izak Eybers illustrated in the sixties in an article with opposing conclusions to Cross on the fragments of Samuel from cave four, another alternative was also possible.²² It finally became the inspiration for a serious investigation of Qumran scholarship and the result of dissertations of work in this area resulted in this approach to the book of Daniel as advocated and applied here.

4. Potholes in the Way of Textual Criticism

Let us list the potholes in the way of textual criticism in order to minimize that of our own in textual analysis:
1. The results of Julius Wellhausen *et al* with axioms of higher-critical method (HCM = source, tradition, literary, genre, redactional, canonical or relecturing) cannot be accepted for a proper understanding of the Word of God.²³ 2.

like Deuteronomy 18:18 in fragment 6 line 6? Are we to say that the scribe was eclectic in his procedure, taking sometimes from one and at other times from another Vorlage? No such Vorlage survived at Qumran. The theory of multiple Vorlages is based on postulation not evidence (contra Tov 1992, 191 "this period was characterized by textual plurality.")

²¹The research of J. G. Janzen on Jeremiah (1965 and 1967) for example, and observations on 4QJer also needs serious reviews. It seems as if the Vorlage to 4QJer^d was torn and stitched at an angle of 45 degrees across the column. This may be a theory for the omission and misspellings of names that appear twice in the text. These may have been illegible to the copyist. The *phenomenon of condensation* of texts could be for functional purposes or because the method of copying was by memory. There is also the *phenomenon of abbreviation* that was witnessed in the scholarship at the library of Alexandria or later for the Old Testament as witnessed by Justin the Martyr (ca. 150 CE) and Origen in a letter to Africanus (ca. 230 CE). M. Fraser (1972) indicated that the Iliad texts that existed before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (167 BCE) are longer than those Iliad texts after his time (Fraser II 1972: 691 note 278). The *phenomenon of epitomizing* of texts in the ancient world was discussed by Francis Witty (1974: 111-112) and these works coincide with the origin of Qumran manuscripts and the Septuagint. Nothing is mentioned by E. Tov (1992) about these important phenomena in the quality of scribal scholarship of the Second Temple Period.

²²There are a number of problems with F. M. Cross's presentation of 4QSam^a in 1953, and the article of Izak Eybers in 1960 helped to see more: typographical error in Column 2 line 4 (also seen by Eybers); Cross left open spaces in his transcription e.g. last half of line 16 that is open and the first half of line 17 which is strange; Cross used the so-called Septuagint to reconstruct the text whereas a better option is to use the Masoretic Text; Cross and Eybers both admitted that there is a scribal error in Column 2 line 7 (Cross 1953: 22; Eybers 1960: 6). Not mentioned by Cross is that the scribe is inconsistent in his own procedures by not converting the independent first person pronoun to a short form. The expansions in the text are considered by Eybers as "targumistic" (Eybers 1960: 5). Whereas Eybers calls it a targumic gloss, Cross and Tov see it as a textual form. Cross argued it was an older type Hebrew text and Tov agreed with this (Tov 1992: 273). A difficult explanation for both Cross and Eybers was the triple entry of a phrase (Cross 1953: 23 and Eybers 1960:9). In our view it seems as if the scribe was confused by the last word in 1 Samuel 1:23 and a misreading of the *ayin* of the first word in 1 Samuel 1:24 for a *shin* resulting in a double reading in this section. Misreading of letters by the scribe of 4QSam^a is one of his problems. The origin of the confusion points to a misreading of Paleo-Hebrew script. The best option is not to view it as equal then to the consonantal textual form of the Masoretic Text nor the Greek text presumed to be the Septuagint, but that it is a parabolic text fulfilling a function that can explain the quality of copying. There was no Paleo-Hebrew Vorlage that compares to the Greek versions. An obvious error, double reading, targumistic addition, change in order of the verses and a triple reading all point to period of degenerative scholarship. A. van der Kooij (1982: 187 footnote 46) outlined the criticism that Eybers levelled against F. M. Cross: that Cross rejects the MT too quickly "kritiek op Cross: hij verwerpt de MT te snel".

²³The dominant methods of the Higher Critical Method (HCM) over two centuries are *source* (literary) criticism, *form* criticism, *tradition* criticism, and *redaction* criticism. "These methods focus on genetic relationships and historical growth of the biblical tradition as viewed by its practitioners. Accordingly, they are described as being 'diachronic' in nature." "This method separates the divine from the human and treats the human as any human production in isolation from the divine" (Hasel 1985: 115). It will be seen that in the 1994 Pontifical Biblical Commission, pope Ratzinger encouraged this approach and scorned the biblicist fundamentalists that they are too "naive". In 1970 a new method originated which Hasel identifies with the synchronic method (Hasel 1985: 116). It was structuralism. While diachronic investigations focused on the historical-evolutionary sequence with a linear horizontal interest, the synchronic (achronic) approach emphasized the internal relationships of that system, that the various elements within a text has mutual and simultaneous interdependence (ibid). The synchronic investigation does not want to be limited to a specific time span (ibid). Hasel indicated that this approach since 1970 may be also called an aesthetic literary criticism. We now know that this method is called the relecturing method and this trend spans 1970-2008 and is still ongoing. Sook-Young Kim indicated in the appendix of her book on the role of the relecturing method that its proponents are B. S. Childs [1970], J. Vereylen [1977] and a host of other scholars (also Randall Heskett 2001) who argue that there is no final way to understand their meanings in this paradigm. Holistic relecturing scholars were inspired by Childs: Chris Franke (1991); Marvin Sweeney (1988); Christopher Seitz (1996); Ronald Clements (1981); Paul Wegner (1992); Gerald T. Sheppard (1985); Eugene Lovering (1996); Rolf Rendtorff (1984); Patricia Tull Willey (1996); and H. G. M. Williamson (1994) (See Sook-Young Kim, *The Warrior Messiah in Scripture and Intertestamental Writings* [Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010], Appendix A). Pope Ratzinger further said in 2007 that "Canonical exegesis' -reading the individual texts of the Bible in the context of the whole - is an essential dimension of exegesis. It does not contradict historical-critical [HCM] interpretation, but carries it forward in an organic way toward becoming theology in proper sense" (Ratzinger, *Jesus of Nazareth* 2007: xix). The trend in interpretation that is called the *Canonical Relecturing Method* (CRM) is wholeheartedly devoted to the *hermeneutics of suspicion*. It is imperative for proper textual analysis to operate with a *hermeneutics of affirmation* and accept the data of the text to speak for itself and do not manipulate the textual data to fit their own reconstruction or models from the outside as the hermeneutics of suspicion or HCM and CRM is doing. The *Hermeneutics of Suspicion* has worn out their readers in the laymen benches. Many laymen are tired of the confusion about the Word of God that is promoted in affiliation with the conventional HCM and CRM methods. Various reactions can be seen in the *Hermeneutics of Suspicion* churches: a. Bible is a closed book. b. Bible is just for

The axioms of Emmanuel Tov that the Hebrew Text originated in its present form in the Second Temple Period; that the text was fluid before and during that time; that there was a multiplicity of textual forms existing side by side during and after that period, cannot be accepted.²⁴ 3. *Eclecticism* has no part in our methodology since this scholar is operating with a one text method.²⁵ 4. Instead of the instability of the text, Qumran actually demonstrated that there was one-standard text existing and that all other textual forms, deviating from this one standard form [in our assessment and axiom the current consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition] are secondary.²⁶ Although the book of Tov is a standard text in conventional textual criticism, it is in need of a revision with the above axioms in mind.

5. Hermeneutical Shift Needed

The shift from a *hermeneutics of suspicion* to that of a *hermeneutics of affirmation* is cardinal to analyze the Word of God since the eclectic scholar's fabrication of a word²⁷ that can be considered by contemporaries as his/her version of the word of God, is not biblically sustained and in fact leads to nihilism.²⁸ There are not a variety of Words of God that are even opposing and contradicting to each other at times.²⁹ What scholars so far have overlooked is the role played by book-burning practices,³⁰ library thefts,³¹ persecution,³² that led to the

professors. c. Bible is for those days not for me today. d. Bible is too difficult to understand. e. Unless there is a cleric to interpret the Bible, I will not read it. f. The HCM and CRM are sometimes substituted for subjective methods by the laymen but that is not wrong. g. Substitution of methods of interpretation can sometimes take on superstitious and charismatic searches for proof texts fitting an occasion method. God does speak sometimes to some people this way in an emergency but the normal way is by reading quietly with reflection and attention.

²⁴The multiplicity of deviations, variants and slips of manuscripts within each version lends support to the idea that they cannot be primary but must have been secondary. D. N. Freedman indicated that the work of Cross on Samuel "from Cave 4 with their non-Masoretic Hebrew text provided a major breakthrough in this discipline" (Freedman 1981: 3-7). Later, M. Goshen-Gottstein overstated "all scholars are united in . . . the belief that the Hebrew text was not at all unified . . . [and] that we ought to differentiate between different Hebrew textual traditions" (Goshen-Gottstein 1992: 204-213). The student of Cross, J. Janzen gave impetus through his analysis of the theory that two different Hebrew texts co-existed at Qumran. This is not the place for a re-evaluation of the Qumran corpus of Jeremiah, but a re-evaluation is in dire need and offers promising alternatives. Gottstein complaint in the 1992 paper that evolutionary thinking has produced in the past two models: textual broadening and diversification versus narrowing and unification (Goshen-Gottstein 1992: 205-206). E. Tov argues for textual plurality and variety in the Second Temple period (Tov 1992: 117). His data is convenient but his axioms need revision. Hermann Stipp also supports the multiplicity of texts for the Second Temple period (Stipp 1990:16-37).

²⁵This means that the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition is accepted as the very Word of God and the only reliable source for evaluation of any other version or translation.

²⁶Theorists differ about the issue. Paul de Lagarde worked with the *Urtext theory*. Paul Kahle, Sperber, Greenberg, Ginsburg, Nyberg worked with the *Vulgar text theory*. Albright and Cross worked with the *Locale-text theory*. Tov and Barrera worked with the *Literary development of Urtext theory*. My theory is the *one text per book theory*, canonized when the author finished it, accurately transmitted and due to troubled times copied during degenerative scholarship at Qumran. Multiple theorists worked with a three localities theory, a three recensions theory, a multiple texts theory, a multiple localities theory, multiple schools theory, multiple scribes theory, multiple methods theory, multiple genres theory, one primary text theory and a degeneration of texts theory, which is evidenced for the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Philo Juddaeus was active in the middle of this period of degeneration and of Eupolemus it is said that he is the one who "could not follow our writings quite accurately" as Josephus mentioned in *Contra Apionem* I, 218 about Eupolemus. This is evidence of the *phenomenon of degeneration*.

²⁷*Eclecticism* is the method where the editors "pick and choose" the readings in order to reconstruct an assumed or postulated "original." The product of the method of eclecticism is emendation. Fraser explained that it was especially the method of the Library of Alexandria and since it was transmitted to Rome, and by Cicero handed down to posterity, it is of lasting importance, even though its achievement in itself is of little note . . . One feature of the philosophy of this period (first century BCE) deserves preliminary notice: the tendency of the schools to blend (Fraser I 1972: 486-487 and II 1972: 703 note 62 and 70). Aristophanes wrote a book On Words suspected of not being used by the early Writers (204-189 BCE) (Fraser I 1972:460). Epiphanius locked him up to die (Fraser 1972: 458). Aristarchus later improved the text of Homer when it seemed logical to him (Fraser I 1972: 464). This librarian, operating post the origin of the Septuagint and concurrent with the Qumran corpus *ad hoc* reworked or recasted the text. There was a drop in intellectual activity at the Library of Alexandria after Antiochus Epiphanes, post-164 BCE.

²⁸"Frequently the work of exegetes is purely critical - dealing with the original formation of the text - and makes little effort to penetrate its inner meaning. Bowing before the exigencies of 'science,' exegetes are no longer disposed to interpret Scripture in the light of faith, and hence they end up calling in question essential truths of faith, such as the divinity of Christ, the Virginal conception, the salvific and redeeming value of Christ's death, the reality of the Resurrection, and the institution of the Church by Christ." Brian Harrison, "Catholic Bishops of the 1980s: Attitudes to Scripture and Theology," *Roman Theological Forum* 20 (November 1988).

²⁹When revelation took place to a prophet, the detail and data could only have come in one way, not in opposing and conflicting ways.

³⁰Tacitus reported book-burning actions in Rome in reaction to the books of Cordus: "the fathers ordered his books to be burned . . . but some copies survived, hidden at the time, but afterwards published" (Tacitus *Annals* 35 in Cramer 1945: 196). Cassius Dio reported the censorship of the books of Cremutius Cordus in the days of Tiberius (before 37 CE) and wrote that "his daughter Marcia as well as others had hidden some copies" (see Cassius Dio LVII 24.4 in Cramer 1945: 195).

³¹Parsons indicated that "under his reign [Eumenes II of Pergamon], for the second time the Hellenic world was ransacked for manuscripts . . . Where the originals were now more difficult to find and sometimes unprocurable, copies were made for the princely

degeneration of scholarship in the copying process of manuscripts and books.³³ The role of memorizing as tool to copying,³⁴ dictation,³⁵ *slips of the eye, ear, hand, memory, and tongue* are majorly neglected aspects of text-critical scholars. That is why there is a need for textual analysis of the books of the Bible instead of textual criticism. The manuscripts need to be analyzed rather than critically assessed.

6. Approach and Purpose for Daniel 9:24

The approach here is to recognize that the translators were doing their best to be true to what they perceived as their Vorlages. Therefore, the investigation in this research attempted to reconstruct the Vorlage for each translation (Qumran Greek or Late Roman Greek or Byzantine Greek) or each relevant manuscript in order to see whether a Semitic base was the origin of some or all of the variants.

This approach is quite different from that of studying the translation techniques, since the focus is not on the translator behind the translation but rather on the copyist of the Vorlage to the translation.

As far as *translation techniques* are concerned, this researcher is somewhat skeptical of the success of such an investigation since one is dealing with doubtful layers,³⁶ meaning *firstly* that copyists made errors: (1) wrong or different divisions of letters, words or paragraphs; (2) substituting letters or transposing them; (3) relying on memory instead of the text on his desk; (4) not always knowing what to do with supra-linear corrections or entries; (5) misconstrued illegible sections on his manuscript. *Secondly*, readers to the translators made errors in similar ways even if the copyists were perfect in their copying. *Thirdly*, translators made errors: (1) by mishearing; (2) confusing letters and sounds; (3) relying on memory; (4) transposing letters and words.

In this researcher's approach variants in the versions are not due to a *free* translation of the consonantal text of the Masoretic text but rather to an error that entered the process of transmission through a copyist or by the process of reading by a reader or the process of translation from a translator who misread or misheard. One can identify these as five slips: *slip of the tongue, slip of the hand, slip of the memory, slip of the eye and slip of the ear.*³⁷ It is thus imperative to reconstruct the possible Vorlage to each manuscript and to understand the origin of a variant in that way by comparison with other reconstructions. Variants sometimes coincide in the same zone in the verse in the versions lending support to the idea that an illegible reading in a Semitic text commonly used by all of the scribes of the versions led to these variants. This was the approach particularly in this research.³⁸

bibliotheke of the famous Mysion city" (Parsons 1952: 24-25).

³²Johnson and Harris mentioned that "in 303 the Emperor Diocletian made a concerted effort to destroy all Christian libraries, and many perished, but the one at Caesarea survived" (Johnson and Harris 1976: 66).

³³Fraser discussed the degeneration of Homer scholarship in the time of Aristarchus (175-145 BCE), which is contemporary with Qumran, at the library of Alexandria. Aristarchus tried to improve the text of Homer when it seemed illogical to him (Fraser I 1972: 464). "Application of this and other principles of criticism might lead either to emendation (μεταθεσις) or to preference for one reading over another, or, when longer passages were involved, to censure or even suppression of the entire passage" (Fraser I 1972: 464-465). This is happening with Homer's texts in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, after the origin of the original Septuagint and is also the time of the origin of Qumran texts.

³⁴Word order problems and problems at the boundaries of word and phrases are evidences of a scribe's disability with memory.

³⁵*Dictation as method* of copying is seen in the Codex Sinaiticus by Skeat (Skeat 1956: 183); and further supporters of dictation as method are listed by him like J. F. Eckhardt in 1777, F. A. Ebert in 1820, W. A. Schmidt in 1847, T. Birt in 1882 and 1907, G. H. Putnam in 1894, A. Volten in 1937 for the Middle Egyptian kingdom of Egypt, J. Černý in 1952 about errors in Egyptian texts due to dictation (see Skeat 1956: 183). There can be different modes of dictation: a second party dictates; self-dictation upheld by J. Balogh in 1927 and F. Hall in 1913 (Skeat 1956: 186); interplay of dictation and direct consultation theorists like F. Zucker in 1930 (Skeat 1956: 189-190). This means that copying was done first by dictation and then collation was done by direct consultation. Strabo xiii.I. 54 complains about writers in Alexandria and Rome and said γραφουσι φαυλοις χρομενοι και ουκ αντιβαλλοντες careless writers who touch the surface (= threw their texts on the market) and do not put one against the other (= without collation) (Skeat 1956: 181). Skeat supplies evidence that Codex Sinaiticus was copied by dictation (Skeat 1956: 191-192 and on 193 Skeat cancels subconscious dictation for the origin of errors on such a large scale).

³⁶One is reminded of J. Wevers' comment in the introduction to the Göttingen edition (G^{ed}) of the LXX of Genesis that he does not live under the illusion that he has constructed the original LXX "Der Herausgeber unterliegt nicht der Illusion, dass er durchgängig den ursprünglichen Septuaginta text wiederhergestellt habe." The original text of the Greek Septuagint does not exist (Frankel 1841: 4; Kahle 1915: 439 where Kahle also said "Die älteste Form dieser Übersetzung rekonstruieren zu wollen, ist eine Ütopie...") Thus, Septuagint or LXX is an elusive task, so how does the scholar with a computer try to establish a translation technique of a text that is not fixed but elusive and to take the irony one step further, comparing it to an original Hebrew as the Arabist Wellhausen did and then claim dogmatically for centuries as navigator to HCM and CRM that the Hebrew was only concocted, reworked and added later and should be emended?

³⁷Koot van Wyk (2012): 158-175.

³⁸To have no Vorlage as pilot guideline, is to end up nowhere. That is why the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition is the first and primary step to be treated by the scholar-reader as the very Word of God and from that form the degeneration and deviances

7. Daniel 9:24 Textually Analyzed: Daniel as Futuristic Chronographer or Pseudonym Historian

One of the challenges of our time is to get behind the time periods mentioned by Daniel.³⁹ These include metals in succession; animals in succession; 2300 evenings and mornings (Daniel 8:14); time, times and half a time (Daniel 7:25. Cf. Revelation 12:14); seventy sevens (Daniel 9:24); 1290 days (Daniel 12:11) and 1335 days (Daniel 12:12). Modern consensus feels comfortable with the view of the heathen historian Porphyry who lived during Jerome's time and who insisted that Daniel was an attached name to a book that originated after Antiochus Epiphanes and thus back-reading into the history of Antiochus was involved here. It is the celebrated view of John Collins and many other modern scholars in Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and non-religious persuasions.

The age of Rationalism after Orthodoxy of the 17th century opened up this trend, and although pushed aside for a long time until 1843/4 when William Miller suggested Christ would come according to Daniel 8:14 with the 2300 years prediction and He did not, Christianity then swung fully into the hands of Porphyry by bringing Epiphanes into play.⁴⁰

started in centuries to come as we witness in the versions. For the establishment of the Masoretic tradition as the standard text, see Van Wyk (2004) and (2011).

³⁹The end of the 12th century grappled with the same issues confronting us, not only for the book of Daniel but also for the book of Revelation and even an interplay between the two books. The works of Joachim de Fiora and Alexander Minorita are full of these considerations. Sabine Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar des Alexander Minorita: Zur frühen Rezeption Joachims von Fiore in Deutschland in Monumenta Germaniae Historica Studien und Texte*, Band 3 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1991).

⁴⁰The Chronographical approach to times in Daniel can be seen in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, chapter 4 in ANF, 1:138; Justin the Martyr in *Dialogue with Trypho*, chapter 32 in ANF 1:210; Irenaeus in *Against Heresies* bk 5 chapter 26 in ANF 1: 553-555; Tertullian in *An Answer to the Jews* chapter 8 in ANF 3: 159-160; Clement in *Stromata* or *Miscellanies* book 1 chapter 21-23 in ANF 2:324ff.; Julius Africanus in *Chronography* fragments 16-18 in ANF 6: 134-137; Origen in *Against Celsus* book 6 chapter 46 in ANF 4: 594. Hippolytus is 'a pivotal expositor' for Daniel and he has a dualistic interpretation with chronographical data mixed with Antiochus Epiphanes for chapters 8-11 of Daniel in "On Daniel" chapters 4-7 in ANF 5: 179. Hippolytus wrote his Greek commentary on Daniel and it was edited in Paris in 1672 and J. A. Frabricius published all in Hamburg in 1716-1718. Porphyry (233-304) claimed Daniel was written after 167 BCE and one wonders how much influence Hippolytus (236) had over Porphyry on these attempts of back-reading into Antiochus Epiphanes. See J. Moffat, "Great Attacks on Christianity: II Porphyry, 'Against Christians,'" *Expository Times* 43/2 (1931): 73. The Syriac Father Aphrahat (290-350) was against Porphyry sometimes and pro-Porphyry at other times, see *Demonstration V Of Wars* chapter 6 in NPNF 2nd series vol. 13 page 354; also chapter 20 page 359 and chapter 22 page 360. Ephrem Syrus of Edessa (306-373) was also sometimes contra-Porphyry and sometimes pro-Porphyry on interpreting the periods and events of Daniel, see his *Sermo Asceticus* in *Opera Omnia*, Greek-Latin edition Vol. 1 page 44 and *Opera Omnia* 5: 215; cf. P. M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *JTS* 27 (1976), 24. Ephrem Syrus wrote his commentary on Daniel in 370 CE and it was published by Peter Benedict in Rome in 1740 in both Syriac and Latin. Polychronius (374-430) was in favor of Antiochus Epiphanes and not Rome in Daniel 2; 7; 9 and 11, (see his *In Daniele* in Angelo Mai, *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* vol. 1 2nd edition, page 111). A number of Fathers were contra-Porphyry and saw Rome as the fourth kingdom or animal in Daniel: Cyprian of Carthage (200-258); Lactantius (250-330); Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340); Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386); Chrysostom of Constantinople and Antioch (347-407); Theodoret of Antioch (386-457) and Jerome (340-420) in *Liber Danielis Prophetiae* in *MPL* 28 (1846) col. 1309ff.; also *Commentaria in Daniele* in *MPL* 25 (1845) col. 491 (HK). See also C. Trieber, "Die Idee der vier Weltreiche," in *Hermes* 27 (1892), page 321-344. Also Bodo Gatz, *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen* (Hildesheim 1967) page 7. Edgar Marsch, *Biblische Prophetie und Chronographische Dichtung. Stoff- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Vision des Propheten Daniel nach Dan.VII.Philologische Studien und Quellen*, Heft 65 (Erich Schmidt Verlag), 1972. In the Middle Ages the *Anno Hymn* interpreted chronographically the fourth kingdom in Daniel as Rome, see Bodo Mergell, *Annohied und Kaiserchronik* in *PBB* 77 Halle 1955, 124-146; Eberhard Nellmann, *Die Reichsidee in deutschen Dichtungen der Salier- und frühen Stauferzeit (Annohied, Kaiserchronik, Rolandslied, Eraclius)* Berlin, 1963 (= *Philologische Studien und Quellen*, Heft 16); E. Hensch, "'Anno' und 'Kaiserchronik,'" in *PBB* 80, Halle 1958, pages 470-479. The Syriac Church Father Simeon of Edessa in 600 interpreted Daniel 7 as Antiochus Epiphanes, see Augustinus K. Fenz, *Die Daniel-Memra des Simeon von Edessa* (Heiligkreuz, 1980); Ramind Köbert S. J. "Zur Daniel-Abhandlung des Simeon von Edessa," *Biblica* 63 (1982), pages 63-78. The Reformation analysis of Daniel as chronographer or Antiochus Epiphanes back-reader is treated by E. Marsch, *Biblische Prophetie und chronographische Dichtung*. It deals with issues between 1530-1662. J. Jonas in 1530 in his iconography for Luther's Daniel translation used the fourth animal as from Italy or Europe. In Amman/Bocksberger's *Biblische Figuren* of 1564 he made an iconographical representation of the four empires of Daniel 7 as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Egypt or the Ptolemies. Fischart/Stimmer in their iconographical representation of 1576 listed Assyria, Persia, Greece and Rome. De Vos/Collaert in their iconographical representation of the four kingdoms of Daniel 7 in 1595 listed Ninus for Babylon, Cyrus for Persia, Alexander for Greece and Julius Caesar of Rome for the fourth animal of Daniel 7. In J. Hauser, *Globus der vier Monarchien* in 1620 one can see the four empires of Daniel 7 as lion = Assyria, bear = Persia, leopard = Greece, non-descript animal as Rome. In Wolfgang Kilian's iconography of 1625 one can see the image of Daniel 7 with the non-descript fourth animal as Rome. Leonhard Meyer in his iconography *Theatrum Historicum* of 1665 also had Rome for the fourth animal. The same can be seen in the iconography of A. Leubold in 1662. Luther saw the fourth animal as Rome as one can see in Melancthon's *Carion's Chronicle* in the 1550 English edition: "And there is added that besyde the Romeine empyre there shall ryse an other empyre full of cruelnesse, and suche one that shall make a new lawe agaynst Gods worde: and that is the Mahometisch and Turkysh empyre now a dayes" (Fol. vⁿ). Philip Melancthon's commentary on Daniel, *Commentarius in Daniele Prophetam* appeared

The commentary of Jerome resisted Porphyry and demonstrated case by case that his calculations do not match the Word of God. The principle of the *year for a day* should be mentioned here. It was the interpretation principle that when Daniel in prophecy is talking about a day, a year of 360 days is meant. There was a book by John Napier in 1593⁴¹ on the *year-day principle* but actually this principle was much earlier operative even in pre-Christian times.⁴² There are rules involved in applying the year-day principle.⁴³

What is amazing is to see how this *year-day principle* was used before Napier also in Jewish circles. During the time of Saadya Gaon in ca. 990 CE, Yepheth ibn Ali wrote a commentary on Daniel and he also used the *year-day*

in 1543 at Wittenberg. Martin Luther's Exegesis of Daniel, called *Auslegung des Propheten Daniels* appeared in three parts at Wittenberg, 1530-1546. The Reformers worked with a chronographical scheme for Daniel as one can see in the numerous citations in Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645* (Oxford University Press, 1979) and on page 13 she cited Luther in 1535 saying about Daniel: "Though I was not at first historically well informed I attacked the papacy on the basis of the Holy Scripture. Now I rejoice heartily to see that others have attacked it from another source, that is from history, I feel I have triumphed in my point of view as I note how clearly history agrees with Scripture what I have learned and taught from Paul and Daniel namely that the Pope is Antichrist, that history proclaims pointing to and indicating the very man himself" (Basle, 1535) A5. It is not only Luther, but also Tyndale, Wycliff, Knox, Bale, and Calvin in his "Sermons sur les huit derniers chapitres du livre de Daniel," *Calvini Opera* 4. xli-xlii, *Corpus Reformatorum* cols. 442-443 where he stated about the Little Horn of Daniel 8:10-12 "Voila donc quant à ce point de la petite come, combien qu'aucuns le prennent pour Mahomet, ou bien pour l'Antechrist mais c'est le changement qui est avenue en l' empire romain" translated as "As for this subject of the little horn, however, many may take it for Muhammed, or even for the Antichrist, nevertheless it is the change which occurred in the Roman Empire" (Firth page 36). In the period of the counter-Reformation Luis de Alcazar (1554-1613) used a preteristic hermeneutical model of Daniel to interpret it to the past and nothing should be stretched beyond 70 CE. Hugo Grotius of Holland in 1644 and Hammond of England in 1653 took over this preteristic model from the counter-Reformation scholars for the book of Daniel. During the Aufklärung the preteristic model of the counter-Reformation replaced the Reformation model in Protestantism: J. C. Eichorn (1791) took the same position as Alcazar; G. H. A. Ewald (1803-1875); F. Delitzsch (1813-1890); and the Arabist Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) all favoring the back-reading model for the book of Daniel (just like the heathen scholar Porphyry suggested). Moses Stuart of Andover (1780-1852) brought preteristic interpretations of Daniel in 1842 to the USA. D. Samuel Davidson used this preteristic model of Alcazar with Antiochus as the key player in 1844. Scholars who remained with the future chronographical approach for Daniel were Joseph Mede (1586-1698); John Tillinghast (1604-1655); Thomas Beverley (1670-1701); Isaac Newton (1642-1727); Manuel de Lacunza (1731-1801); Adam Clarke (1762-832); Edward Irving (1792-1834); James Begg (1800-1868); and Francois Gaussen (1790-1863). Rationalism as method for the book of Daniel led to skepticism and a shifting of Daniel as meaning not the coming of the Messianic kingdom but rather a coming of a knowledge of the Lord (Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. di Lella AB *The Book of Daniel* (Golden City, New York: 1978), page 149. It is in the light of the historicist model that the depressed William Miller, who said Christ would come in 1843/4 based on Daniel 8:14 as 2300 years (*year-day principle* applied), and He did not, wrote to the Hebrew Grammar professor George Bush of New York University asking him whether he made a mistake with his methodology. Interesting is the letter that came back from George Bush to Miller: "Nay, I am even ready to go so far as to say that I do not conceive your errors on the subject of chronology to be at all of a serious nature, or in fact to be very wide of the truth. In taking a day as the prophetic term for a year, I believe you are sustained by the soundest exegesis, as well as fortified by the high names of Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Kirby, Scott, Keith, and a host of others who have long since come to substantially your conclusions on this head. They all agree that the leading periods mentioned by Daniel and John do actually expire about this age of the world, and it would be a strange logic that would convict you of heresy for holding in effect the same views which stand forth so prominent in the notices of these eminent divines" (*Advent Library*, No. 44, page 6 as cited by George I. Butler, *Facts for the Times: A Collection of Valuable Historical Extracts on a Great Variety of Subjects of special interest to the Bible Student, from Eminent Authors, Ancient and Modern* [Battle Creek, Michigan: Pacific Press, Oakland, California, 12th July 1885], pages 38-39).

⁴¹John Napier, *A Plaine Discovery of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (Edinburgh 1593). In the Table of the First Treatise he said, "generally a day for a year, a week for seven years, a moneth for 30 years and a year for a yeare of yeares or three hundred & three score yeares proved in the proposition."

⁴²It appears that the three Wise men from the East who studied scriptures and expected the birth of Jesus on time, may have used Daniel 9:24 to calculate the date of His birth using the *year-day principle*. What they did is to say that seventy sevens refer to 490 years and with the *year-day principle* it means 490 years. Using Ezra 7 for the 7th year of Artaxerxes or 457 BCE as starting point, they could correctly calculate with Daniel 9 Jesus' baptism in 27 CE and His death in 31 CE. With the system established they could follow the Ancient Near Eastern rule that a person becomes a public figure at the age of 30 and if His ministry was to start in 27 CE, then this public figure should be born in 4 BCE, the year they came to look for Him. If this is true, the Wise Men from the gospels applied Daniel as a futurist chronographer and not a pseudonym historian back-reading the events of Antiochus Epiphanes.

⁴³One year in Babylonian times was calculated in the farmer's calendar with a lunar-orientation consisting of 354 days for the year. The year calendar that the fortune-teller of Nebuchadnezzar used, was one well-known even in the late-Kassite period. It consisted of a year of 360 days with each month exactly 30 days. It was their "divine year" in which the gods revealed to the king what he should or should not do every day, eat and should not eat to avoid calamities. Since they were daily, the texts are called *Hemerologies*, hemera (Greek = ἡμέρα) for *day*. Periods (of prophecy) in the book of Daniel are calculated with this system in mind. It was also known as the *economical calendar* for business contracts. Examples of these 360 day a year texts are: R. Labat, "Un Almanach Babylonien (V R 48-49)," *RA* 38/1 (1948): 13-40 dating from the time of Sargon (722-705); L. Matoush, "L'Almanach de Bakr-Awa," *Sumer* 17/1 (1961), 17-66, which is IM 63388; F. X. Kugler, "Eine rätselvolle astronomische Keilschrift," *ZA* 17 (1903), 238; Ch. Virolleaud, "Fragments du 'Calendrier babylonien,'" *ZA* 18 (1904), 228-231. Many duplicates existed on these texts as well. The best complete example is Rene Labat, "Un Calendrier Cassite," *Sumer* 8 (1952), 17-36 plus two plates. It was made for the Cassite king Nazimaruttash (1430-1380 BCE) which is the same time as the Cassite king Kurigalzu (see L. Matoush 1961, 21). One example: In the seventh month Tishrit on the 3rd day the king should not eat fish.

principle stating that the 490 days of Daniel 9:24 refers to 490 years. The principle was also used by the scholar Hengstenberg (1831) in his commentary of Daniel claiming that the 2300 evenings and mornings of Daniel 8:14 is actually days and thus with the principle applied, years. He started the beginning of the calculation in 423 BCE.⁴⁴

Hengstenberg said "We may look for the cleansing of the sanctuary a.d. 1877" and Thomas Myers considered this interpretation as "so adverse to the interpretation of these Lectures, that we must be content with this passing allusion to it" (Thomas Myers, *Commentaries on Daniel (Calvin)* dissertation 33). The *year-day principle* was probably also operative in Assyrian and Babylonian calculations.⁴⁵

7.1. Yaphet ibn Ali and 490 Years

In his commentary on Daniel, this Karaite Jew wrote about the seventy sevens of Daniel 9:24

7.1.1. Arabic Commentary of Yepheth ibn Ali interpreting the 70 weeks

هي اسابيع سنين למנו יבין جعله ذلك اربع مائة وتسعين سنة وقد فملها في ما بعد
(A^{Yepheth ibn Ali} 990-1010 D.S. Margoliouth Oxford edition 1889 Daniel 9:24)

The Arabic Commentary of Yepheth reads here "These seventy weeks are *weeks of sabbatical years*, making 490 years; below they are divided into periods."⁴⁶

⁴⁴Ezra 7 was given three dates in the past: **1) 457 BCE** (defended by John Wright, *The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem* [London: Tyndale Press, 2nd edition, 1958]; **2) 398 BCE** as the seventh year of Artaxerxes II by H. H. Rowley, "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Vol.*, Part I [1948], 117-149; reprinted in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays* [London: Lutterworth Press, 1952], 131-159; N. H. Snaith, "The Date of Ezra's Arrival in Jerusalem," *ZAW* 63 [1951], 53-66; H. Cazelles, "La mission d'Esdras," *VT* IV [1954], 113-140; **3) 428 BCE** by William Albright, W. Rudolph, V. Pavlovsky, "Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras," *Biblica* 38 [1957], 275-305; 428-456], see John Bright, *A History of Israel* [London: SCM Press, 1970^{6th}], 375-386). The issue was Ezra 7:7 whether it is the *seventh year* or the *thirty seventh year* (by emendation). This gives us understanding where Hengstenberg got his startingpoint from, ending at 1877 for the cleansing of the sanctuary. Thomas Myers explained that the *terminus a quo* "is said to be the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, whose date is given in Ptolemy's Canon An. Nabonassar 325, which according to the method of verifying the date here used, is b.c. 424 "which, added to the year when apostasy was no longer restrained, a.d. 66, makes 70 weeks or 490 years" which was the view of George Duke, *The Times of Daniel: Chronological and Prophetical, Examined with relation to the point of contact between sacred and profane Chronology*. James Darling, 1845 (republished by Nabu Press, 2011). (See Thomas Myers for a more comprehensive bibliography <http://www.ccel.org>). Isaac Newton worked with this system also in 1733. B. Blayney worked on Daniel 9:20-27 in 1775. There is the work of G. S. Faber in 1811; J. A. Stonard in 1826; that of P. Allwood in 1833 all dealing with the issues involved in Daniel 9:24-27, as Myers pointed out.

⁴⁵Assyrian and Babylonian metrics are well known to scholars and a number of articles have appeared on these issues. There is the article by Van der Waerden, "Babylonian Astronomy III: The Earliest Astronomical Computations," *JNES* 10 (1951), 29-34. There is Neugebauer, "Studies in Ancient Astronomy VIII, The Water Clock in Babylonian Astronomy," *Isis* 37 (1947), 37-43. There is Reiner and Pingree, "A Neo-Babylonian Report on Seasonal Hours," *AJO* 25 (1947-77): 50-55. S. Smith, "Babylonian Time Reckoning," *Iraq* 31 (1969), 74-81. Leo Oppenheim also wrote on the night watch in terms of the *mana* in "A Babylonian Diviner's Manual," *JNES* 33 (1974), 200: 64 and 205 note 38. The article important here for our calculations is that of F. Rochberg-Halton, "Stellar Distances in Early Babylonian Astronomy: A New Perspective on the Hilprecht Text (HS 229)," *JNES* 42 no. 3 (1983), 209-217. **Assyrian and Babylonian Metrics of Time** Rochberg-Halton indicated in his article that the water-clock was in Mesopotamia since Old Babylonian times. That would coincide with the life and death of Joseph of the Bible. He cites Neugebauer 1947, 37-43. They used the sundial or solar hour but also the water-clock or measurements in weight of water for two hours which equal 1 *mana*. **Assyrian and Babylonian Celestial Time and Terrestrial Time** Assyrians and Babylonians distinguished between celestial time and terrestrial time. The term *bēru ina šamem* means "celestial *bēru*". The standard unit used to measure distance is UŠ which means "degree." It is termed in one text as terrestrial UŠ or *ina qaqqari*. The other measurement is *mana* (a certain weight of water that equals two hours). In one text TCL 6 21:27, a ratio is given that 1800 celestial *bēru* = 1 terrestrial UŠ (Rochberg-Halton 1983, 211 footnote 11). Sixterrestrial UŠ are equal to one *mana*. We know that one *mana* is equal to two hours since B. Meissner in his book *Babylonien und Assyrien* Vol. 2 (Heidelberg: 1925), 394-395 indicated that the night for the Assyrians and Babylonians were divided into three watches. Each watch had two *manas* and that equals two hours for each *mana*. Since the *mana* is two hours or 120 minutes long, the 6 terrestrial UŠ have to be divided into 120 minutes leading us to 20 minutes for each terrestrial UŠ. **Celestial year and terrestrial day** If 1 terrestrial UŠ equals 1800 celestial *bēru* and if 1 terrestrial UŠ equals 20 minutes, then how many celestial *bēru* will there be in one day? 20 minutes x 3 x 24 = 1 day. Thus, 1800 celestial *bēru* x 3 x 24 = 129600 celestial *bēru*. One terrestrial day equals 129600 celestial *bēru*. The year in Assyrian and Babylonian reckoning had either 354 lunar days or 360 days in an economic or civil year (see the Kassite 360 day a year *Hemerological Text* as clear evidence of this dating to 1154 BCE). A number of later duplicates were made of this text or similar hemerological texts during the neo-Assyrian and neo-Babylonian Empire. All of them have 360 days in one year, 30 days in each of the 12 months. How many years of 360 days will there be in 129600 celestial *bēru*? 129600 divided by 360 terrestrial days equals 360 terrestrial days or a celestial year. **In conclusion:** One celestial year of 360 days = one terrestrial day. This is the Assyrian and Babylonian *year-day principle*. The divine year or heavenly year is equal to the terrestrial day.

⁴⁶D. S. Margoliouth's translation of the Arabic, 1889: 49. This means that Yepheth supported in 990 the *year-day principle* for exegesis of the prophetic book of Daniel. In his commentary, Yepheth says "The scholars who preceded Joseph ibn Bakhtawī explained the 2300, 1290, and 1335 as years; the Rabbanites, too, spoke of the end, and fancied that from the third year of Cyrus to the end would be 1335

7.3.2. Hebrew Text of the Babylonian-Yemenite Tradition

שב עימשבעימנחתךעל-עמדועלעירקדשךלכלאהפשעולחתמחטאטאולכ [רעווןלהביאצדק
ע למים] [slip of the memory, slip of the ear] [ול הת מחווןביאולמשחקדשקדשים
(Hebrew ^{Babylonian-YemeniteManuscript} Shelomo Morag page 136 Daniel 9:24)

7.3.3. Hebrew Text (1598) next to the Arabic text of Saadia Gaon

שב עימשבעימנחתךעל-עמדועלעירקדשךלכלאהפשעולחתמחטאטאולכפרעווןלהביאצדק
ע למיםולחתמחווןביאולמשחקדשקדשים
(Hebrew ^{Saadia Gaon Ms.or. Fol. 1203: 121} Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Daniel 9:24)
960 handcopied in 1598

ולמשח. This extra *matres lectiones waw* may mean that the Messiah is meant in which case we may have a year-day interpretation scribe copying here in 1598. Gaon's Arabic text read it without the *lamed* preposition but not with the extra *matres lectiones waw*, namely *ومسح*.

7.3.4. Arabic Text of Saadya Gaon⁴⁸

هي سبعين اسبو عقطعت على قومكو على قرية قدسك لفنا الخرم والجرم
والخثنة وغفران الذنب ومجي عدل الدهور وكنتم الوحي والنبوة ومسحخاظ الاقداس
(Arabic ^{Saadya Gaon H. Spiegel Berlin} Daniel 9:24)
950 edition 1906

7.4. Yaphet ibn Ali's Arabic Text and Daniel 9:24

In the case of Yaphet's Arabic translation of the text of the Hebrew, his rendering of the Hebrew gave the preposition *lamed* as in the original Hebrew but Saadya Gaon did not supply that. This means that Yaphet (990) read it as *ولמשח* but Saadya (950) read it as *ومسح*. Notice that the Hebrew text that was placed interlinearly with Saadya's Arabic translation read *ולמשח*.

7.4.1. Hebrew Text of Yepheth ibn Ali⁴⁹

שב עימשבעימנחתךעל-עמדועל [קדשךלכלא] [פשעולחתמחטא] [תולכפרעווןלהביאצדק
ע למיםולחתמחווןביאולמשחקדשקדשים
(Hebrew ^{Saadia Gaon Ms.or. Fol. 1203: 121} Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Daniel 9:24)
960 handcopied in 1598

7.4.2. Hebrew Text of the Babylonian-Yemenite Tradition

שב עימשבעימנחתךעל-עמדועלעירקדשךלכלאהפשעולחתמחטאטאולכ [רעווןלהביאצדק
ע למים] [slip of the memory, slip of the ear] [ול הת מחווןביאולמשחקדשקדשים
(Hebrew ^{Babylonian-YemeniteManuscript} Shelomo Morag page 136 Daniel 9:24)

7.4.3. Hebrew Text

שב עימשבעימנחתךעל-עמדועלעירקדשךלכלאהפשעולחתמחטאטאולכפרעווןלהביאצדק
ע למיםולחתמחווןביאולמשחקדשקדשים
(Masoretic Text ^{Leningradensis B Folio 445verso} BHS Daniel 9:24)
1008

7.4.4. Hebrew Text next to Arabic text of Saadya Gaon

שב עימשבעימנחתךעל-עמדועלעירקדשךלכלאהפשעולחתמחטאטאולכפרעווןלהביאצדק
ע למיםולחתמחווןביאולמשחקדשקדשים
(Hebrew ^{Saadia Gaon Ms.or. Fol. 1203: 121} Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Daniel 9:24)
960 handcopied in 1598

⁴⁸For the Arabic text of Saadya Gaon on Daniel 9:2, I am using the edition of H. Spiegel (1906) from Berlin. It is in Hebrew characters but I have typed it with Arabic fonts. A Hebrew text is placed interlinearly in 1598 and differs with the rendering of Saadya Gaon in the Arabic especially with "and anointing" rendering of Gaon here in Daniel 9:24.

⁴⁹The Arabic Text of Yepheth bin Ali is provided by D. S. Margoliouth in 1889. One can reconstruct the Hebrew text of Yepheth since he transliterated the Hebrew text and the whole text was then transliterated later in Hebrew and Margoliouth transliterated it back into Arabic again but left the Hebrew biblical text untouched. Yepheth's Hebrew text compares very well with that of the Babylonian Yemenite Tradition of Daniel but he omitted some words.

7.5. Bringing the Septuagint in for Clarity

There are the simplistic suggestions by modern linguists that on the basis of Qumran (and impetus to the view was incepted, among others, especially by F. M. Cross with his views on 4QSam^a in 1953) that the Septuagint provides an alternative Vorlage existing side by side with the Masoretic like consonantal text in pre-Christian times. The original Septuagint does not exist and none of the editors of the Göttingen edition ever claimed that they have succeeded in reconstructing the original Septuagint.⁵⁰ My research indicated that remnants of the original Greek Septuagint can be found in the Books of Numbers and Leviticus from Qumran Cave four but that it aligns more to the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition than to the post-Christian survived editions.⁵¹

The contrast between the byzantine survived Greek manuscripts (claimed by many to be the Septuagint) is in fact, in this researcher's finding, a possible tampering with the text at the library of Alexandria during and after the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, as research indicated that Homer's Classical Greek texts were emended, enlarged, shortened, reworked and mutilated during the same time.⁵²

Other factors also played a cardinal role in the poor condition of the copies, like the five slips: *slip of the eye, slip of the ear, slip of the hand, slip of the memory, slip of the tongue*. Added to this, are the persecution times that brought with it imperial library building projects and organized theft of library books, banning of certain books (prophetic books), book burning at various times leading to the attempts by concerned groups to hide their good copies and keep it from the public domain. It was not easy in Christian times to get hold of a good copy for translation or copying. The Xerox Process of manuscript copying suffered by degenerative scholarship due to these factors.

It would be good to put two Greek texts side by side and consider the origin of problems. The first example is from Alfred Rahlfs edition dating to 1935:

7.5.1. Greek Text according to Rahlfs' Edition

εβδομηκοντα εβδομαδες εκριθησαν επι τον λαον σου και επι την πολιν Ζιων συντελεσθηαι την αμαρτιαν και τας ακικιας σπανισαι και απαλειψαι τας αδικιας και διανοηθηναι το οραμα και δοθηναι δικαιοσυνην αιωνιον και συντελεσθηαι το οραμα και ευφραναι αγιον αγιων

(Greek^{Origen's Hexapla 240 reconSyro-Hexapla Paul Tella 616 reconCodex 88 A. Rahlfs 1935: 923-924 Daniel 9:24})

7.5.2. Greek Text Origen according to Syro-hexapla

εβδομηκοντα εβδομαδες εκριθησαν επι τον λαον σου και επι την πολιν Ζιων συντελεσθηαι την αμαρτιαν και τας αδικιας σπανισαι και απαλειψαι τας αδικιας και διανοηθηναι το οραμα +και δοθηναι δικαιοσυνην αιωνιον √ και συντελεσθηαι το οραματα *και προφητην √ και ευφραναι αγιον αγιων

(Greek^{Origen Hexapla 230recon Codex Ambrosianus Syro-hexapla Paul Tella 616 recon Fields Origen Hexapla 1875: 926 Daniel 9:24})

7.5.3. Greek Text according to Theodotion

εβδομηκοντα εβδομαδες συνετηθησαν επι τον λαον σου και επι την πολιν την αγιαν σου του συντελεσθηαι αμαρτιαν και του σφραχισαι αμαρτιας και απαλειψαι τας ανομιμας και του εξιλασθαι αδικιας και του αγαχειν δικαιοσυνην αιωνιον και του σφραχισαι ορασιν και προφητην και του χρισαι αγιον αγιων.

(Greek^{Theodotion 190 Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus 450 Edition of A. Rahlfs 1935: 923-924 Daniel 9:24})

⁵⁰Paul Kahle stated that "Die älteste Form dieser Übersetzung rekonstruieren zu wollen, ist eine Ütopie. . . ." (Kahle 1915: 399-439, especially page 439). The same words were used by J. Wevers in the Göttingen edition about his reconstruction of the Greek of Genesis: "Der Herausgeber unterliegt nicht der Illusion, dass er durchgängig den ursprünglichen Septuaginta text wiederhergestellt habe" (Wevers *Introduction* of the edition for *Genesis*). Rahlfs did not believe that his version edition of the Septuagint represented the original (Olofsson 1990: 79 footnote 49). Max Margolis indicated that "the road to the original Septuagint leads past many stations" (Margolis 1916: 140). The corrupt Septuagint text view can be traced back as early as Justin the Martyr, Origen, Jerome, Z. Frankel (1841) and in modern times P. De Boer (1938). Origen for example was complaining in a letter to Africanus (PG 11:36-37 and 40-41) that the text of some Greek copies of Daniel is longer, sometimes 200 verses longer. His solution was that the church should reject their copies and "put away the sacred books among them" and "flatter the Jews, and persuade them to give [us] copies that are untampered with, free from forgery" *ut nos puris, et qui nihil habeant figmenti, impertiant* (PG 11:40-41). Z. Frankel is very surprised about the high regard that Augustine had for the Septuagint (Frankel 1841: 258). Augustine's high view of the Septuagint can be found in *On Christian Doctrine* ii. 15, "And to correct the Latin we must use the Greek versions, among which the authority of the Septuagint is pre-eminent as far as the Old Testament is concerned".

⁵¹Van Wyk, 2013: 114-138.

⁵²M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1970.

7.5.4. Greek Text of Papyrus 967 Acoustic Perceptions

εν θεος[*midrashic addition*] [*omission*] εβδομαδας· [*acoustic misperception*] ετι· [*addition*] επι τον λαον σου εκρηθησαν· [*wordorder problem due to slip of the memory*] και επι την πολλν σου· [*midrashic addition*] Σε· ιων [*spelling idiosyncratic of scribe's acoustic misperception*] συντελεσθηναι την αμαρτιαν και τας ακικιας σπανισαι και απαλειφαι τας αδικιας και διανοηθηναι το οραμα και δοθηναι δικαιοσυνην αιωνιον και συντελεσθηναι το οραμα και ευφραναι αγλιον αγλιων

(Greek ^{Pap967} _{200recon} http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PTTheol/PT16_09r.jpg Daniel 9:24)

If one compares the post-Christian later version of the so-called Septuagint in Origen's Hexapla with the earlier Papyrus 967, also presented here, one can see the origin of the variant in Origen's Hexapla as a clear example of *acoustic misperception* when he heard the dictation of the text not as σου but as Σειων. In Origen's Hexapla it appears as Σιων. Papyrus 967's scribe actually corrected himself because both the correct and the error appear in the same line. One must understand the process of the copying in those days. Someone scribbled on papyrus to make a notebook Vorlage to the reader of the reproduction team. That notebook served then the reader to the copyists afterwards and they have to make a choice whether it is the supralinear correction σου or in-text Σιων.

Obviously Origen opted for the in-text error and his Septuagint Copy from teams related to this Papyrus 967 provides the key for his variant recorded for the Septuagint. The Scribe of Papyrus 967 in 200 CE also had some *midrashic additions* and *word-order problems*, the last which is typical of *slips of the memory*. Note that the Masoretic Text reading of σου is there in the wrong order but that "your holy" has dropped out here. It is not a substitution of "holy" for "Zion" in the Septuagint, which some may consider as proof of interpretation license used by the Septuagint translators originally. The original Septuagint is elusive and treating our survived manuscripts as the Septuagint is problematic indeed and will lead to similar problematic results.

If one compares the text of *Theodotion* and Papyrus 967 at this spot with the *Hebrew of the Consonantal Text of the Masoretic Tradition*, our results look like this:

7.5.5. Theodotion (190 CE)

Daniel 9:24 επι τον λαον σου και επι την πολλν την αγιαν σου

7.5.6. Papyrus 967 (200 CE)

Daniel 9:24 ετι[*addition*] επι τον λαον σου εκρηθησαν· [*word-order problem due to slip of the memory*] και επι την πολλν σου· [*midrashic addition*] Σε· ιων [*spelling idiosyncratic of scribe's acoustic misperception*]

7.5.7. Hebrew of Consonantal Text of Masoretic Tradition

Daniel 9:24 על-עמך ועל-עירך קדשך

As far as the state of the text was concerned during the Patristic period, the Fathers were continuously concerned about the quality of the texts and many retranslations and re-editions originated because of this concern.⁵³

7.6. Latin Translations and Daniel 9:24

The Old Latin text⁵⁴ is represented and reconstructed from readings of the Church Fathers, and Tertullian

⁵³Van Wyk, 2013: 128 at footnotes 20-21.

⁵⁴For the Vetus Latina of Daniel or the Old Latin (which is a translation that was made in about 189 CE in Africa), I used a number of sources. The extracts from the Codex Wirceburgensis was used which dates between 450-550 CE. It is a palimpsest which is in the library of the university of Würzburg. D. Fridericus Münter presentation of the work of Stephani Tetens (1819) *Fragmente Versionis Antiquae Latinae Antehieronymianae prophetarum Jeremiae, Ezechielis, Danielis, et Hosea e codice rescripto Bibliothecae Universitatis Wirceburgensis*. The microfilm does not contain the whole text of Daniel but is helpful for comparison with that of Pierre Sabbathier, also from the library of the University of Würzburg. P. Sabbathier, *Bibliorum sacrarum latinae a Versiones antiquae seu vetus Italica et caeterae quaecumque in codicibus mss. et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quae cum vulgata latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus Italica et caeterae, quaecumque, observationes ac notae indexque novus ad Vulgatam e regione editam indemque locupletissimus, opera et studio D. Petri Sabbathier, ordinis Sancti Benedicti, e Congregatione Sancti Mauri*, Bd. I-III. Rheims 1743-1749. It contains what was collected of the Vetus Latina from citation of the Church Fathers. The Church Fathers have not always presented the form consistent which each other as one can see in Daniel 12:2. Augustine said about the origin of the Vetus Latina: "those who translated the Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek can be enumerated, but the Latin translators by no means. For, in the early days of the faith when any one received a Greek manuscript into his hands and seemed to have ever so little facility in language, he dared to translate it." Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana* ii, 11 as cited in E. Nestlé's article "Bible Versions" in *The New Schaff-*

represents this verse as follows:

7.6.1. Old Latin Text of Sabaterium (Tertullian)

septuaginta hebdomadae breviatae sunt super plebum tuam et super cicitatem sanctam quodusque inveteretur delictum et signentur peccata et exorentur injustitiae et inducatur iustitia unगतur sanctus sanctorum

(Old Latin^{Tertullian}₁₁₀ Adversus Jud. chapter 8. page 140. a. b. reconPIERRE SABBATHIER^{Daniel 9:24}_{1743: 876})

7.6.2. Latin Vulgate Text (Jerome)

septuaginta hebdomades abbreviatae sunt super populum tuum et super urbem sanctam tuam ut consummetur praevaricatio et finem accipiat peccatum et deleatur iniquitas et adducatur iustitia sempiterna et impleatur visio et prophetia et unगतur sanctus sanctorum

(Vulgate^S₄₅₀ reconWEBER^{Daniel 9:24})

The Old Latin text seemingly dropped out the tuum after sanctam but it was restored by Jerome in his Vulgate in 389 CE of which codex S dating to 450 CE is the best representation of Jerome. The origin of the error in the Old Latin in 180 CE seemed to have happened by their different division of the Hebrew continuous text of their Vorlage.

7.6.3. Hebrew Text of the Consonantal Text of the Masoretic Tradition

שבועים שבעים נחתך על־עמך ועל עירך וכל־כלא הפשעו לחתמחטא ותולכפרעו וולהביא צדק
על מימולח תמחזון ונביא ולמשחקד שקדשים

(Masoretic Text^{Leningradensis}₁₀₀₈ BFolio 445verso^{Daniel 9:24}_{BHS})

7.6.4. Hebrew Text of the Old Latin Reconstructed

שבועים שבעים נחתך על־עמך ועל עירך וכל־כלא הפשעו לחתמחטא ותולכפרעו וולהביא צדק
על מימולח תמחזון ונביא ולמשחקד שקדשים

(Slightly Modified Masoretic Text^{Leningradensis}₁₀₀₈ BFolio 445verso^{Daniel 9:24}_{BHS} Old Latin modified)

There seems to have been a division of the final *kaph* separated from the word "holy" so that the consonant was attached to the preposition *lamed* of the infinitive that follows and it was interpreted as a duplication. It could have originated from a *slip of the hand* which means a bad handwriting in 180 CE that served the Old Latin reader to the translator as notebook for translation. A new word originated meaning "all or everyone" and the expected *tuum* dropped out of the Old Latin and made way for a form *quodusque* meaning "everyone" or "in that all the way". The result looks like this:

7.6.5. Hebrew Reconstructed Text of the Old Latin (180 CE)

Daniel 9:24 קדשך כלא

7.6.6. Hebrew of Consonantal Text of Masoretic Tradition

Daniel 9:24 קדשך לכלא

7.7. Coptic of Daniel 9:24

The translation of the Coptic in Henry Tattam of 1836 and the Manuscript of 1374 both used the *Bohairic Infinitive for Cause* "to anoint" in Ms. Or. 1314 as ⲉⲓⲓⲛⲱⲥⲁ and in Henry Tattam of 1836 as ⲉⲓⲓⲛⲱⲥⲁ to render the Hebrew of the Consonantal text which is ולמשה. It is said that the Coptic follows the "Septuagint" but notice that the Coptic is correctly using the word "holy" after town or city]baki eouab. but the translation is uniquely "upon *my* holy town/city" with the addition of the first personal pronoun [I]- at the beginning of the noun for city meaning that the Hebrew may have read עיר. This could have happened by a *slip of the hand* (bad

handwriting) of the original copy of the Vorlage to the Coptic reader for the translating scribes.⁵⁵

7.7.1. Coptic Text

nebdomac ausatou ebol ejen peklaoc nem eden]baki eyouab
epjinrefjwk ebol nje vnobi nem pjiner cvragizin nhannobi
nem efw] ebol nnianomia nem epjin,w ebol nhan[injonc nem
epjinini noudiay/k/ neneh nem epjiner cvragizin nouhoracic
nem ouprov/t/c nem epjinywhc mpeyouab nte n/eyouab
(Coptic^{British Library MS Or. 11557A} Tattam¹⁸³⁶ Daniel 9:24)

7.7.2. Coptic Text British Library Or. 1314

nebdomac ausatou ebol ejen peklaoc nem
eden]bakieyu•epjinyrefjwk ebol nje vnobi nem
pjiner cvragizin nhannobi nem efw] ebol nnianomia nem
epjin,w ebol nhan[injonc nem epjinini• noudiay/k/ neneh
nem epjiner cvragizin nouhoracic nem ouprov/t/c nem
•epjinywhcmpeyouab nte n/eyouab
(Coptic^{British Library MS Or. 1314} Daniel 9:24)

The vocabulary of the Coptic in Daniel 9:24 are not similar in Greek loanwords to the "Septuagint" presented by Origen in his Hexapla of 240 CE. The word *epjiner cvragizin* is linked to the word *σφαργισαι* used by Theodotion in his 190 CE text and the word *nnianomia* is linked to the word *ανομιαν* used by Aquila in his 130 CE text. There is a plus in the Coptic that is not shared by any of the other versions. It is the phrase *nem epjinini noudiay/k/ neneh* "and to the giving of an everlasting covenant".

7.7.3. Origin of the Variant in the Coptic

The origin of this addition in the Coptic is simple to see. The Hebrew Vorlage had a problem in that the letters were not clear, a case of the *slip of the hand* or bad handwriting. The *aleph* and the *taw* were similar. The *yod* was read as a *resh*. The problem originated this way:

7.7.4. Hebrew Reconstructed Text of the Coptic (1374 or 1836)

Daniel 9:24 ולהב י ולהביא

7.7.5. Hebrew of Consonantal Text of Masoretic Tradition

Daniel 9:24 ולהביא

⁵⁵Great help was obtained from Hany N. Takla, "The Coptic Biblical Book of Daniel," *St. Shenouda Coptic Newsletter* 1996: 5-9 who then in personal communication offered much help. Takla listed all the sources of the Coptic of Daniel that he could find: Bohairic Codices JR419 (Daniel); JR420 (Daniel); P58 (Minor Prophets and Daniel); P96 (Minor Prophets, Daniel); PL. Bibl. 11 (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel); PL. Bibl. 13 (Daniel Lamentation); SA. Bibl. 72 (Minor Prophets, Daniel, Revelation); SA. Bibl. 73 (Minor Prophets, Daniel); SA. Bibl. 93 (Daniel, Minor Prophets); VB 123 (Daniel, Minor Prophets). The earliest book in his list is R. Tuki, *pidwm nte Tmetrefsemsi ntinuct/rion iui nem hapdinh/bi ntew piremfwout nem hapdinhwc nem pikatameroc pabot*. [Khidmat al-Asrar al-Mukaddasah]. Rome: 1763. Other books on the Coptic text of Daniel are: F. Münter, *Specimen versionem Danielis Copticarum, nonum eius caput Memphitice et Sahidice exhibens*. Romae: 1786. E. Quatremere, *Daniel et les douze petit Prophetes Manuscrits Coptes de la Bibliotheque Imperiale no. 2. Saint-Germainno. 21*. Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheques Publies par l'Institut de France. VII. Paris: 1810. The one available to me is H. Tattam, *Prophetas Majores in Dialecto Linguae Aegyptiacae Memphitica seu Coptica Edidit cum Versione Latina*. T. H. Ezechiel et Daniel. Oxford: 1852. For Coptic Text of Daniel publications by other scholars like: J. Bardelli (1849); A. Ciasca (1889); G. Maspero (1892); W. Crum (1893); I. Cyrille (1899); J. Leopoldt (1904); W. Till (1936, 1937, 1952); L. Amundsen (1945); H. Quecke (1970); S. Pernigotti (1985); B. H. Pise (1987, 1998). It is better to consult the works of Hany N. Takla in the *Coptic Newsletter* cited above.

It is amazing to notice that Jesus in his citation of the same passage of Daniel 9:27 in the Gospel of Mark at 13:14 *οταν δε ιδητε το βδελυγμα της ερημωσης στηκοτα* used the *future tense* and in this process canceled Antiochus Epiphanes (past tense) out in line with the Septuagint form (future tense) and with the original Hebrew of Daniel (future tense). What this implies is that the hermeneutics of Daniel 9:24-27 events should not be connected to Antiochus Epiphanes but events that would be later than Jesus.

10. Conclusion

Finding the correct text of Daniel 9:24 implies making a *measuring decision* first, how to determine a ruler from which all texts will be measured. Using 4QDan^a and realizing that the text of the consonantal text of the Hebrew tradition is preserved almost 99% the same fix the scientific observation that the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition in the Hebrew is very reliable and stable. All other texts should thus *conform or be evaluated* with this form of the text. As all versions display problems of slips of various kinds in the copying and preservation of the text, they are tainted texts attempting to be originally very literal and truthful to the Hebrew but difficult times brought with it many variants due to the dependency on degenerative texts.

The form of Daniel 9:24 has been understood through the ages with *forward reading* by most interpreters but there was also *back-reading* to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes by the heathen interpreter Porphyry. Misunderstanding the *year-day principle* in Daniel's prophetic times, Porphyry was opposed by Jerome and others. The Arabic Jew of the Middle Ages, Yepheth ibn Ali in the 10th century supported the year-day principle in Daniel 9:24. He did not acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah but agreed that there are 490 years involved here in Daniel 9:24. Understanding this principle opened up startling discoveries to scholars through the centuries. The *date of the start of the Messiah's work* was predicted absolutely to the year (27 CE) and makes one understand why the Three Wise Men were able to *calculate the birth of Christ* in 4 BCE so accurately.

<주요어>(Keywords)

textual criticism, textual analysis, degenerative scribal practices, slips, Daniel 9:24, *year-day principle*.

<참고문헌>(References)

- Aejmelaes, A. "Septuagintal Translation Techniques - A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account." In *LXX: Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, eds. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, 381-402. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Africanus on Daniel. http://ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-06/anf06-50.htm#P2340_657845
- Albright, W., Rudolph, W., Pavlovsky, W. "Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras." *Biblica* 38 (1957), 275-305; 428-456.
- Allwood, P. *A Dissertation concerning the Chronological Numbers Recorded in the Prophecies of Daniel*. London, 1833.
- Amner, R. *An Essay towards the Interpretation of the Prophecies of Daniel, with Occasional Remarks upon Some of the Most Celebrated Commentators on Them*. London, 1776.
- Birks, T. R. *The Two Later Visions of Daniel: Historically Explained*. London, 1846.
- Birks, T. R. *The Four Prophetic Empires and the Kingdom of Messiah, Being an Exposition of the First Two Visions of Daniel*. London, 1845.
- Blayney, B. *A Dissertation by Way of Inquiry into the True Import and Application of the Vision Related, Daniel 9:20 to the End, Usually Called Daniel's Prophecy of Seventy Weeks*. Oxford, London, 1775.
- Bond, Z. *Slips of the Ear: Errors in the Perception of Casual Conversation*. California, San Diego: Academic Press, 1999.
- Bright, J. *A History of Israel*. London: SCM Press, 1970^{6th}, 375-386.
- Bush, G. *The Prophecies of Daniel. Vol. I and II*. New York: Hebrew in New York City University, 1844.
- Butler, G. I. *Facts for the Times: A Collection of Valuable Historical Extracts on a Great Variety of Subjects of special interest to the Bible Student, from Eminent Authors, Ancient and Modern*. Battle Creek, Michigan: Pacific Press, Oakland, California, 12th July 1885.
- Casey, P. M. "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976), 15-33.

for future tenses in the Hebrew original in Daniel 11:26-29 is applicable by extension also to Daniel 9:24-27 as we indicated here.

- Cazelles, H. "La mission d'Esdras." *Vetus Testamentum* IV (1954), 113-140.
- Chaîne, M. "Bookreview." *Revue de L'Orient Chrétien* 26 (1927-1928), 4-5. *Coptic Bibliography* 4 Supplement 2 September 1989-February 1990 under directorship of Tito Orlandi in Unione Accademica Nazionale: Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari. Rome: Centro Italiano Microfisches, 1990.
- Cramer, F. H. "Bookburning and Censorship in Ancient Rome: A Chapter from the History of Freedom of Speech." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 6, Issue 2: 1945, 157-196. See also <http://www.jstor.org>
- Cross, F. M. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 132 (1953), 15-26.
- _____. "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966), 81-85.
- Cumming, J. *Prophetic Studies, or Lectures on Daniel*. London, 1852.
- Darby, J. N. *Studies on the Book of Daniel: a Course of Lectures by J. N. Darby. Translated from the French, and revised by the Author*. 1848.
- De Boer, P. *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI. A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel*. Amsterdam: Paris, 1938.
- Deist, F. *Towards the Text of the Old Testament*. Pretoria: D. R. Church Booksellers, 1978.
- Doukhan, J. B. "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 17 (1979), 1-22.
- Durand, J. J. F. *Die Lewende God: Wegwysers in die Dogmatiek*. Pretoria: N. G. Kerkboekhandel, 1976.
- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1984.
- Erbes, J. *The Peshitta and the Versions. A Study of the Peshitta Variants in Joshua 1-5 in Relation to Their Equivalents in the Ancient Versions. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Semitica Upsaliensa 16*. Stockholm, Sweden: Elanders Gotab, 1999.
- Eybers, I. H. "Notes on the Texts of Samuel found in Qumran Cave 4. Studies on the Books of Samuel." In *Papers read at 3rd Meeting of Die O.T. Werkgenootskap in Suid-Afrika*. Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1960, 1-17.
- Faber, G. S. *A Dissertation on Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks*. London, 1811.
- Fenz, A. K. *Der Daniel-Memra des Simeon von Edessa. Die exegetische Bedeutung von BrM 712 Add 12172 Fol 55b-64b. Fototechnische Wiedergabe, Übersetzung und Erklärung seiner alttestamentlichen Grundlage. Heiligenkreuz Studienreihe. 1. Baden: Heiligenkreuz, 1980.*
- Field, F. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta. Post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro Hexaplari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit Fridericus Field. Prolegomena, Genesis-Esther*. Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1875, 1964.
- Firth, K. R. *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645*. Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Folsom, N. S. A *Critical and Historical Interpretation of the Prophecies of Daniel*. Boston, 1842.
- Forbes, C. A. "Books for Burning." *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 67 (1936), 114-125.
- Frankel, Z. *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*. Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841.
- Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Vol. I: Text; Vol. II: Notes. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Freedman, D. N. *An Appreciation. In Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith*. 3-7. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1981.
- Frost, G. "Adoption of the Codex Book: Parable of a New Reading Mode." *The Book and Paper Group Annual* Volume 17 [<http://aic.stanford.edu/consp/bpg/annual/v17>, 1998].
- Gaussen, L. *Lectures on the Prophet Daniel, considered in a Series of Lessons for a Sunday School*. Geneva, 1848.
- Gelston, A. *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Goshen Gottstein, M. *The Aleppo Codex*. The Hebrew University Bible Project. Jerusalem, 1976.
- _____. "The Development of the Hebrew Text of the Bible: Theories and Practice of Textual Criticism." *Vetus Testamentum* 42/2 (1992), 204-213.
- Hammershaib, E. "On the Method, Applied in the Copying of Manuscript in Qumran." *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959), 415-418.
- Hanhart, R. "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences." In *LXX: Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, 339-379. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Hartman, L. F. and di Lella, A. A. "The Book of Daniel." *Anchor Bible*. Golden City, New York: 1978.
- Hasel, G. *Biblical Interpretation Today*. Washington, D.C: Biblical Research Institute, 1985.
- _____. "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27." *Ministry* (May 1976), 1D-21D.
- Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1897-1906. Reproduced Graz 1954.

- Hengstenberg, E. W. *Die Authentische des Daniel und die Integrität des Sachariah*. Berlin, 1831.
- Hensch, E. "'Anno' und 'Kaiserchronik'." *PBB*80. Halle 1958, 470-479.
- Heskett, R. "Messianism within the Book of Isaiah as a Whole." Ph.D. dissertation, St. Michael's College, 2001.
- Janzen, J. G. "Studies in the text of Jeremiah." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. 1965.
- Jerome. *Commentary on Daniel*. (1958), 15-189. http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/jerome_daniel_02_text.htm accessed 15th March 2015.
- Johnson, E. D.; Harris, M. H. *History of the Libraries in the Western World*. 3rd edition. New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Methuchen. 1976.
- Jobes, K. H. "A Comparative Syntactic Analysis of the Greek Versions of Daniel: A Test Case for New Methodology." *Bulletin of the IOSCS*. Chicago IL. Vol. 28 (Fall, 1995), 19-41. (online available)
- Kahle, P. "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*88 (1915), 399-439.
- Kim, Sook-Young. *The Warrior Messiah in Scripture and Intertestamental Writings*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010. Appendix A.
- _____. "Approaches to the Interpretation of Old Testament Messianism," *Sahmyook Theological Review* 16 (2008): 238-263.
- Köbert, R. S. J. "Zur Daniel-Abhandlung des Simeon von Edessa." *Biblica*63 (1982), 63-78.
- Kugler, F. X. "Eine rätselhafte astronomische Keilschrift." *Zeitschrift für die Assyriologie*17 (1903), 238.
- Labat, R. "Un Almanach Babylonien (V R 48-49)." *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*38/1 (1948), 13-40.
- _____. "Un Calendrier Cassite." *Sumer*8 (1952), 17-36 plus two plates.
- Lee, S. *The Events and Times of the Visions of Daniel and St. John*. London, 1851.
- Lee, S. *An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy*. London, 1849.
- Löfgren, O. *Die Äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927.
- Lübbe, J. C. "Describing the Translation Process of 11Q^gJob: A Question of Method." *Revue de Qumran*13 nos. 49-52 (1989), 583-593.
- _____. "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of 4Q^{Sam}." *Revue de Qumran*14 no. 54 (1989b) 255-265.
- Macleod, R. M. *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World*. London, 2000.
- Mai, Angelo. *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e vaticania codicibus*. Vol. 1. Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1828.
- Marsch, E. *Biblische Prophetie und Chronographische Dichtung. Stoff- und Wirkungs-geschichte der Vision des Propheten Daniel nach Dan. VII. Philologische Studien und Quellen*. Heft 65. Erich Schmidt Verlag. 1972.
- Martin, Malachi. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Volumes I-II. In *Bibliothèque du Muséon*. Volume 45. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958.
- Martin, R. A. "A Computer Generated Descriptive Lexicon of the LXX and Theodotianic Texts of Daniel." In *Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting*, Loews Anatole Hotel, Dallas. November 8, 1980.
- Matoush, L. "L'Almanach de Bakr-Awa." *Sumer*17/1 (1961), 17-66.
- McCarthy, J. F. "Two views of Historical Criticism." *Roman Theological Forum*77 (September 1998) <http://www.rtforum.org/lt/lt77.html>.
- Mergell, B. *Annolied und Kaiserchronik*. PBB 77 Halle. 1955, 124-146.
- Meissner, B. *Babylonien und Assyrien*. Vol. 2. Heidelberg: 1925.
- Moffatt, J. "Great Attacks on Christianity: II. Porphyry, 'Against Christians'," *The Expository Times*43/2 (Nov. 1931), 72-78.
- Morag, S. *The Book of Daniel: A Babylonian-Yemenite Manuscript*. Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sepher Publishing House LTD.
- Münter, F. *Specimen versionem Danielis Copticarum, nonum eius caput Memphitice et Sahidice exhibens*. Romae: 1786.
- Myers, Thomas. *Commentaries on the Prophet Daniel* Vols. 1-2. Calvin Translation Society. 1852; 1853. <http://www.ccel.org>.
- Napier, J. *A Plaine Discovery of the whole Revelation of Saint John*. Edinburgh. 1593.
- Nellmann, E. *Die Reichsidee in deutschen Dichtungen der Salier- und frühen Stauferzeit (Annolied, Kaiserchronik, Rolandslied, Eraclius)* Berlin, 1963 (= *Philologische Studien und Quellen*, Heft 16).
- Nestlé, E. "Bible Versions." *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Vol. 2 (1908), 115-121.
- Neugebauer, J. "Studies in Ancient Astronomy VIII, The Water Clock in Babylonian Astronomy." *Isis*37 (1947), 37-43.
- Newton, I. *Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*. London, 1733.
- Nyberg, H. "Das tekstkritische Problem des AT. am Hoseabuch demonstriert." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*52 (1934), 241-254.
- Olofsson, S. *God Is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int, 1990.

- Oppenheim, L. "A Babylonian Diviner's Manual." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*33 (1974), 200-205.
- Orlinsky, H. "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*13/2: 81-91, 1941.
- Pannenberg, W. *Basic Questions in Theology*. Volume 1. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Parsons, E. *The Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenistic World: Its Rise, Antiquities and Destructions*. London. 1952.
- Poullisse, N. "Slips of the tongue: speech errors in first and second language production." In *Studies in Bilingualism*20. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999.
- Quecke, H. *Daniel et les douze petit Prophetes Manuscrits Coptes no 21. Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheques Publies par l'Institut de France*. VII. Paris: 1810.
- Rahlf, A. *Septuaginta-Studien I-III*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- _____. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Ratzinger, J. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC. 2007.
- Reiner and Pingree, "A Neo-Babylonian Report on Seasonal Hours." *Archiv für Orientforschungen* 25 (1947-77), 50-55.
- Rochberg-Halton, F. "Stellar Distances in Early Babylonian Astronomy: A New Perspective on the Hilprecht Text (HS 229)." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*42/3 (1983), 209-217.
- Rolloci, R. *Commentarius in Librum Danielis Prophetae*. Edinburgh, 1591.
- Rowley, H. H. "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah." *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Vol., Part I*. Budapest: Globus, 1948, 117-149.
- Sabbathier, P. *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae a Versiones antique seu vetus Italica et caeterae quaecumque in codicibus mss. et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quae cum vulgata latinae versiones antique seu vetus Italica et caeterae, quaecumque, observationes ac notae indexque novus ad Vulgatam e regione editam indemque locupletissimus, opera et studio D. Petri Sabbathier, ordinis Sancti Benedicti, e Congregatione Sancti Mauri*, Bd. I-III. Rheims 1743-1749.
- Schmolinsky, S. *Der Apokalypsenkommentar des Alexander Minorita: Zur frühen Rezeption Joachims von Fiore in Deutschland in Monumenta Germaniae Historica Studien und Texte* Band 3 Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1991.
- Shea, W. "Poetic Relations of the Time Periods in Dan 9:25." *Andrews University Seminary Studies*18/1(Spring 1980), 59-63.
- _____. "When did the Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24 Begin?" *Journal of Adventist Theological Society*2/1 (1991), 115-138.
- Skeat, T. C. "The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production." *Proceedings of the British Academy*42 1956, 179-208.
- Skehan, P. W. Ulrich, E. and Sanderson, J. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IX: Qumran Cave 4 IV. Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Bilingual Manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, plus xlvii plates.
- Smith, H. P. *Samuel. International Critical Commentary*. New York, 1899. Reproduced Edinburgh, 1969.
- Smith, S. "Babylonian Time Reckoning." *Iraq*31 (1969), 74-81.
- Schmolinsky, S. *Der Apokalypsenkommentar des Alexander Minorita: Zur frühen Rezeption Joachims von Fiore in Deutschland in Monumenta Germaniae Historica Studien und Texte* Band 3. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1991.
- Snait, N. H. "The Date of Ezra's Arrival in Jerusalem." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*63 (1951), 53-66.
- Spiegel, H. *Saadia al-Fajjûmi's arabische Danielversion nach einem Manuscript der kgl. Bibliothek in Berlin zum ersten Male herausgegeben, mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen. Inaugural-Dissertation der hohen philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Bern zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde vorgelegt*. Berlin, Druck von H. Itzkowski, 1906.
- Stipp, H.-J. "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neuen alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 34/1 (1990), 16-37.
- Stonard, J. *A Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel the Prophet*. London, 1826.
- Takla, H. N. "The Coptic Biblical Book of Daniel." *St. Shenouda Coptic Newsletter*(1996), 5-9.
- Tattam, H. *Prophetas Majores in Dialecto Linguae Aegyptiacae Memphitica seu Coptica Edidit cum Versione Latina. Ezechiel et Daniel*. Oxford, 1852.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. Cambridge, 1906-1940.
- Thompson, J. A., Talmon, S. and Seeligmann, I. *IDBS*.
- Thenius, O. *Die Bücher Samuels. Kurzgefasster exegetisches Handbuch zum A.T.* Leipzig, 1842, 2nd edition 1864.
- Tov, E. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Tregelles, S. P. *Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of the Book of Daniel*. 1853.

- Trieber, C. "Die Idee der vier Weltreiche," *Hermes*27 (1892), 321-344.
- Tuki, R. pidwm nte Tmetrefsemsi ntinuct/rion iui nem hapdinh/bi nte w piremfwout nem hapdinhwc nem pikatameroc pabot. Rome: Khidmat al-Asrar al-Mukaddasah, 1763.
- Van der Kooij, A. "De tekst van Samuel en het tekstkritisch onderzoek." *Nederlands Theologische Tijdschrift*36/3 (1982), 177-204.
- Van der Waerden, L. "Babylonian Astronomy III: The Earliest Astronomical Computations." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*10 (1951), 29-34.
- Van Wyk, Koot. "The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a Witness to Degenerative Scribal and Copyist Activity." D Lit et Phildissertation, University of South Africa, 2004.
- _____. "Textual Criticism under Scrutiny: Xerox Problems since Epiphanes." *Korean Journal of Christian Studies*75 (2011), 5-19.
- _____. "Linguistic Slips: A Window to Ancient Methods of Bookmaking." *Journal of Biblical Text Research*31 (2012), 158-175.
- _____. "A Presentation of 4QLXXNum in Comparison with the LXX and MT." *Journal of Biblical Text Research*33 (2013), 114-138.
- Virolleaud, Ch. "Fragments du 'Calendrier babylonien.'" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*18 (1904), 228-231.
- Walters, S. D. "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1." *Journal of Biblical Literature*107/3 (1988), 385-412.
- Wells, E. *The Book of Daniel, explained after the following method.* Oxford, 1716.
- Willet, A. *Hexapla In Daniele.* Cambridge: Cantrell Legge, Printer to the Vniuersitae of Cambridge, 1610.
- Wintle, T. *Daniel, an Improved Version attempted, with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory.* London, 1807; 1838.
- Witty, F. J. "Reference Books in Antiquity." *Journal of Library History*9 (1974), 101-119.
- White, W. *Providence, Prophecy, and Popery, as exhibited in the first seven chapters of Daniel.* 1848.
- Wright, J. *The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem.* London: Tyndale Press, 2nd edition, 1958.
- Würthwein, E. *Der Text des AT. Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica von Rudolf Kittel.* 5th ed. Stuttgart, 1988.

<Abstract>

다니엘9:24을 본문 분석에 입각하여 주해함

כותב ויקטור

(경북대학교기초교육원초빙교수, 호주아본데일대학협력교수)

본 연구에서 다니엘9:24의 다양한 고대역본들을 검토하였다. 4QDan^a와 현대히브리어본문이 1% 이내 차이로 강한 연결성을 보이므로 보통 행해지는 본문 취사 선택의 연구 방법 대신 표준본문을 사용하는 방법을 채택하였다. 고대라틴어, 아퀼라, 심마쿠스, 테오도스, 오리겐, 제롬의 불게이트, 콕트어, 시리아어 등의 모든 고대역본에서 오늘날 우리 손에 가진 특권인 표준본문을 발견하려고 시도한 흔적을 찾을 수 있으나 도서관 절도, 문화적 대감, 박해, 도서 소각의 관행 등으로 양질의 원문에 접근하기 어려워 콕트의 위헌 손본들이 이들 역본에서 사용되었다. 많은 이형(異形, variants)들은 손, 시각, 청각, 혀, 기억의 실수에 기인하였으며 역자들이 새로운 본문을 창조하거나 자유롭게 본문으로부터 벗어나려는 의도를 가진 것이 아니었다. 그들에게는 선택의 여지가 없었다. 표준본문을 사용하는 본문 분석 방법의 해롭고 위험한 필사관습과 함께 역본들의 퇴행적 특성을 밝힐 수 있다. 본문 취사 선택의 방법을 따르면 독자 스스로 복원한 자만이 의본문을 창조하게 되므로 허무주의로 이끌리는 반면 표준본문을 사용하는 본문 분석의 방법을 따를 때 마소렛 전승의 자음본문이라는 객관적인 잣대와 잇대어 분석되므로 독자는 차이점을 비교함과 동시에 어떻게 이형이 형성되었는지를 발견하도록 무된다. 다니엘9:24의 라틴어, 헬라어, 콕트어 등 다양한 역본에서 이러한 분석을 시도 하였으며 이형들의 원인을 명확히 이해할 수 있었다. 마소렛 전승의 자음본문과 비교할 때 형태에 관한 한 위헌 손본의 양상을 보였다. 해석의 면에 있어서는 학자들이 연-일법칙을 사용하여 다니엘의 예언적 시간을 바로 이해하고 있었으나 이교 해석자였던 포르피리에 이르러 사건들이 안티오쿠스에 피파네스에게 적용되었으며 이는 제롬을 실망케 하였다. 10세기 유대인 아랍 주석가 예페트 이븐 알리역시 다니엘9:24에 연-일법칙을 적용하여 490일을 490년으로 제안 하였다. 끝으로, 다니엘9:24-27의 시적(詩的) 분석에서 기한을 "정하였다"는 표현을 통해 그 기간이 2,300 주야의 예언과 동일한 출발점인 기원전 457년에서 시작됨을 알 수 있었다. 이러한 규칙을 염두에 둘 때 이제까지 이교 해석자 포르피리의 안경을 통해서만 다니엘서를 읽어왔던 현대 해석자들에게 경이로운 발견의 문이 열린다.